

# THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

---

No. CCXVIII.]

FEBRUARY, 1863.

[VOL. XIX.]

---

## FARRAR'S CRITICAL HISTORY OF FREE THOUGHT.\*

IN a note towards the end of his work, Mr. Farrar expresses his regret that there is no history written of the series of Apologetic Lectures which form a part of English theological literature. We will begin our notice of this new issue of the Bampton Lecture by stating a few facts connected with some of these Lectures.

Mr. Farrar's volume comes before the world with the virtual imprimatur of the Heads of Houses of the University of Oxford. By the will of a Canon of Salisbury who died more than a century ago, that learned body annually appoints a lecturer, whose duty it is to preach and print eight discourses on some theological topic to be chosen (within certain prescribed but not very narrow limits) by himself. The lecturer conforms to the directions of the founder if he helps to confirm or establish the Christian faith, or if he confutes any heretics or schismatics. He may discourse upon the divine authority of Scripture, or upon the authority of the early Fathers in respect to faith and practice. He may uphold the Divinity (by which the founder doubtless meant the Deity) of Christ and of the Holy Ghost. If the lecturer prefers the symbols of his Church to Holy Scripture, he may expatiate on the articles of the Christian faith as expounded in the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds. The lecture is endowed "for ever," and orthodox Churchmen never need lack a topic while "heresy" endures, which will be as long as the human mind reflects. In the fourth century an orthodox bishop enumerated one hundred and fifty-six heresies, and the number has for centuries been augmenting, both in and out of the pale of the Anglican Church.

The Bampton Lecture is not the only endowment of the kind in England. As early as 1692 began the series on the foundation of the Hon. Robert Boyle, designed to prove the Christian religion against notorious infidels. That accomplished

---

\* A Critical History of Free Thought in reference to the Christian Religion. Eight Lectures preached before the University of Oxford in the Year M.DCCC.LXII., on the Foundation of the late Rev. John Bampton, M.A., Canon of Salisbury. By Adam Storey Farrar, M.A., Michel Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford. 8vo. Pp. 684. London—John Murray.

layman wisely forbid the lecturers on his foundation from descending to the controversies among the different sects of Christians. Early in the eighteenth century began the series instituted by the Lady Moyer on the Trinity and the Divinity (Deity?) of Jesus Christ. These lectures came to an end about 1774, on the termination of a lease. Just before the closing of this series, the Warburtonian Lectures began, instituted by the renowned Bishop of Gloucester. They were designed to prove the truth of revealed religion from the completion of prophecy. The University of Cambridge began in 1820 its Hulsean Lectures on the Evidences of Religion, and in explanation of obscure and difficult texts of Scripture; and Trinity College, Dublin, has its lectures, on the foundation of a Mrs. Ann Donnellan, for the encouragement of religion, learning and good manners. There was also in the last century a Hutchins Lecture on the Excellency of the Liturgy of the Church of England, and a Fairchild Lecture on the Wisdom of God in the Vegetable Creation.

There are or have been other series of lectures unconnected with the Established Church. The earliest was a series of addresses on doctrinal and practical subjects by Puritan and Nonconformist divines,—the earliest of them preached in 1659, the latest thirty years afterwards. From the early hour at which they were delivered, they received the name of “Morning Exercises.” Among the more distinguished preachers, we find the names of Owen, Baxter, Bates, Calamy, Daniel Williams and Tillotson. In the eyes of High-churchmen the association of the last-named and illustrious man with so many Nonconformists was always regarded as a blot in his life. He was one of the preachers subsequently to the Restoration, but before the passing of the Act of Uniformity, and when the Exercises were held in Cripplegate church.

In the early part of last century, a lecture was established in London, under the patronage of Mr. William Coward, of Walthamstow, a zealous Calvinist and a man of eccentric character. It seems to have continued about nine years, and to have been preached by eminent London ministers of the Independent denomination. Several volumes contain these weekly lectures, but they bear the different titles of the Lime-Street Lectures, the Coward Lectures and the Berry-Street Lectures. Contemporarily with some of the Coward Lectures was a series of discourses preached at Salters' Hall by eminent Dissenting ministers of London, directed against the doctrines and ceremonies of Popery. More recently (1833), the Congregational Lecture was established by the managers of the Congregational Library in London, designed to illustrate the doctrines of revelation, and in connection therewith to discuss the true principles of philology and philosophy, and to give the history and refutation of the chief corruptions of Christianity which have prevailed in the Church. The preachers



have been Drs. Wardlaw, Vaughan, Pye Smith, Hamilton, Payne, Halley, Davidson and others.

In looking through the names of the long series of lecturers from the days of Boyle to our own time, one cannot fail to be struck not only with the fugitive character of most of their productions, but also with the fact that the authorities with whom their appointment rested have failed to secure the services of some of the most eminent and successful of the apologists for revealed truth. Lardner, the greatest authority on the subject, was as a Nonconformist out of the range of the Heads of Houses at Oxford. But Paley, Watson and Maltby were Churchmen. Their connection with the sister University of Cambridge was, we presume, no hindrance to their appointment. No mere patronage can create, and happily its refusal cannot obstruct, the best works of the best minds. They go to the work for which they are especially fitted by a kind of intellectual and moral necessity. Whether the church and the world receive and reward or reject and blame their labours, they experience the inward satisfaction of exerting their faculties successfully in a noble cause. We can conceive no more interesting and delightful occupation to an intelligent mind than the composition of a work like the *Horæ Paulinæ* of Paley.

The Bampton Lecture differs from the other endowments, not only in its permanent character, but in its annual recurrence. Since 1780, when the series began, there are only three missing links (1834, 1835, 1841) in the chain. Mr. Farrar's is, we believe, the 80th volume in the series of printed Lectures. Were the spirit of the departed Canon to visit the Bodleian or one of the few other libraries in which the collection sleeps almost as undisturbedly as if the volumes were buried in his own tomb, it may be a question whether he would not deplore the failure of his purpose. A more *ponderous* monument than this series of sermons it would be difficult to find between Salisbury Plain and the Pyramids of Egypt. After selecting the Lectures of White, Tatham, Heber, Hampden, Milman, Whately, and one or two of the recent volumes, if the rest were consigned to the trunk-makers no great wrong would be done to theology or literature. An amusing controversy grew out of the publication of White's Lectures on Mahommedanism in 1784. A portion at least of the merit of their composition was claimed by a Dissenting minister, Rev. Samuel Badcock, of Barnstaple. Vain was the solicitude of the founder to keep the work, for which he devoted his estate, out of the hands of schismatics. His regulation that none but graduates of Oxford and Cambridge should preach the lecture was practically violated by the admission of a Nonconformist into a literary co-partnership with the fifth lecturer. It may also be mentioned that Dr. Parr, who was an intimate friend of White, also claimed (and had his claim allowed) the

merit of certain "corrections, substitutions and additions," in the sermons preached by White.\*

Some theological curiosities embedded in the Bampton Lectures will reward the reader sufficiently industrious to dig them up. In 1819, Mr. Belsham held up to reprobation and ridicule some of the paradoxes and calumnies launched in the Lectures of that year by Dr. Moysey. A few years earlier, the amiable Heber, in a spirit of theological knight-errantry, had undertaken to prove the Deity of the Holy Ghost,—a singularly neglected branch of the orthodox system. He has the merit of the discovery, promulgated in his Lectures, that the archangel Michael was the second Person in the Trinity, and the archangel Gabriel the third. In behalf of the latter position, he appealed to the authority of certain "Mahometan doctors." The Bampton Lectures delivered in 1832 by Dr. Hampden won a celebrity which bids fair to secure for them a place in the history of England. In treating the subject of "Scholastic Philosophy considered in its relation to Christian Theology," Dr. Hampden manifested, in the opinion of most clerical readers, "undisguised latitudinarianism." He was supposed to treat the creeds of his Church as mere human opinions, and not articles of faith; and he openly advocated toleration and charity towards all, Unitarians not excepted. He had on one occasion ventured to speak of Unitarians as "Christians." For these unpardonable affronts to the spirit of orthodoxy, he was visited, on being appointed Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford, with a formal censure both by the Heads of Houses and by Convocation. When, in forgetfulness or defiance of this orthodox anathema, the Whig Ministry in 1847 appointed him to the vacant see of Hereford, a tumult arose in the Church such as England has not seen since the days of Sacheverell. The press groaned with angry pamphlets, and thirteen of the Bishops addressed to Lord John Russell a Protest against the appointment. All that a furious clerical agitation could do to stay or reverse the appointment was tried in the civil as well as the ecclesiastical courts, but in vain; and Dr. Hampden remains to this day Bishop of Hereford. The only satisfaction made to the spirit of orthodoxy was, that the latitudinarianism of the Bampton Lecturer of 1832, and of the advocate of the admission of Dissenters to the Universities, has been hidden from view or crushed out of life by the ponderous weight of the mitre.

It is scarcely necessary for us to do more than allude in passing

---

\* A still more amusing violation of a founder's purpose occurred in relation to the Lady Moyer Lecture. It was instituted, as we have stated above, for the defence of the doctrines of the Trinity and the Deity of Christ. Dr. Benjamin Dawson, being appointed lecturer for 1765, availed himself of the opportunity of promulgating Arianism, then very rife among the clergy. His Lectures bear the title of "An Illustration of several Texts of Scripture, particularly those in which the Logos occurs."



to the celebrated Lectures in 1858 delivered by Mr. Mansel, in which scepticism of the most levelling nature was made auxiliary to a submissive orthodoxy, and the lecturer descended from his temporary theological chair amid the applause of Churchmen, for having demonstrated to their satisfaction that religion is beyond the scope of the human intellect, and that theology there can be none.

Such were some of the startling antecedents in the history of the Bampton Lecture when Mr. Farrar undertook it in 1862. Had he chosen to follow the example of some of his predecessors earlier in the century, we should have had another "discharge," as Mr. Belsham termed it, "from the Bampton battery," which might stun for the moment, but would be powerless to silence the voice of truth and good sense. But Mr. Farrar had too much knowledge and self-respect to substitute invective for argument. His work is throughout calm in tone; it is the production of a scholar and a gentleman. That it is a successful treatment of its subject, we are indeed unable to admit. A good "Critical History of Free Thought in reference to the Christian Religion," can only be written by one free to inquire and fearless to speak respecting the doctrines of the Christian religion. Mr. Farrar begins his task by deliberately fettering his limbs. It is evident that he felt all its dangers. Great as his interest is in "Free Thought," he evidently has no purpose of being a martyr or a confessor in its behalf. The spirit of the Canon of *Salisbury* need not be disturbed in its resting-place by the new issue of the Bampton Lectures. "It is done," as the old proverb says, "secundum usum Sarum." Were Mr. Farrar under the authority of the diocesan of the unfortunate vicar\* of Broad-Chalke, he need have no fear of the Court of Arches. He has put an effectual stop to any articles of accusation. In a Preface of more than fifty pages, our lecturer, amongst other things, explains the circumstances which led him to the study of the history of Free Thought.

"He had taken holy orders, cordially and heartily believing the truths taught by the church of which he is privileged to be an humble minister. Before doing so, he had read thoughtfully the great works of evidences of the last century, and knew directly or indirectly the character of the deist doubts against which they were directed. His own faith was one of the head as well as the heart; founded on the study of the evidences, as well as on the religious training of early years. But he perceived in the English church earnest men who held a different view; and, on

---

\* Good Thomas Fuller, speaking of Wiltshire, describes it as "a pleasant county," and adds that "he had heard a wise man say, that an ox left to himself would, of all England, choose to live in the north, a sheep in the south part hereof." But remembering that Wiltshire is in the diocese of the Bishop of Salisbury, we suppose no clergyman left to himself would think it a pleasant county, or would wish to follow Fuller's ox, sheep or any other animal, into that well-watched spiritual pasture.

becoming acquainted with contemporary theology, he found the theological literature of a whole people, the Germans, constructed on another basis; a literature which was acknowledged to be so full of learning, that contemporary English writers of theology not only perpetually referred to it, but largely borrowed their materials from German sources. He wished therefore fully to understand the character of these new forms of doubt, and the causes which had produced them. He may confess that, reposing on the affirmative verities of the Christian faith, as gathered from the scriptures and embodied in the immemorial teaching of Christ's church, he did not anticipate that he should discover that which would overthrow or even materially modify his own faith; but he wished, while exploring this field, and gratifying intellectual curiosity, to re-examine his opinions at each point by the light of those with which he might meet in the inquiry."—Pp. xiii, xiv.

But, with a rare candour, Mr. Farrar disclaims all pretensions to independence in the matter of his criticism. It is, he admits, essentially dogmatic.

"The standard of truth here adopted, as the point of view in criticism, is the teaching of Scripture as expressed in the dogmatic teaching of the creeds of the church; or, if it will facilitate clearness to be more definite, three great truths may be specified, which present themselves to the writer's mind as the very foundation of the Christian religion: (1) the doctrine of the reality of the vicarious atonement provided by the passion of our blessed Lord; (2) the supernatural and miraculous character of the religious revelation in the book of God; and (3) the direct operation of the Holy Ghost in converting and communing with the human soul. Lacking the first of these, Christianity appears to him to be a religion without a system of redemption; lacking the second, a doctrine without authority; lacking the third, a system of ethics without spiritual power. These three principles accordingly are the measure, by agreement with which the truth and falsehood of systems of free thought are ultimately tested."—P. xv.

It is obvious that they who do not recognize "the dogmatic teaching of the creeds of the Church," and who disbelieve one, if not two, of Mr. Farrar's fundamental principles, will feel little satisfaction or interest in the critical part of his work.

There is indeed one singularity in the lecturer's mode of proceeding which is not quite *secundum usum Sarum*. By what arguments can he justify his exclusive use of the three critical tests he names? They form but an insignificant portion of the articles and creeds to which he has surrendered his critical independence. If his faith of *three* points is valid, why not another man's of two or one?

There is a concession to infidelity in the very title of Mr. Farrar's Lectures. "Free Thought," in his definition, is "the struggle of the human spirit to free itself from the authority of the Christian faith." Those who value above all things intellectual liberty, because they believe that it, and it alone, will ultimately secure truth, and who are happy in being able to



combine a firm faith in Christianity with habitual free thought, will not be parties to what they must regard as an unnecessary and imprudent concession. And we submit that the Bampton Lecturer is not justified by usage in making free thought a synonym for disbelief of Christianity. In the last century, the words "free-thinking" and "free-thinkers," through the influence of the sceptical writings of Collins, came to be regarded as synonymous with "Deism" and "Deists." But "free thought" has not yet acquired the bad limitation which the lecturer applies. He appeals in justification to foreign literature, and particularly to the French words *libre pensée*, as his justification. But in a Catholic country words will sometimes acquire an injurious force, which Protestants ought to be slow in imitating. The lecturer himself states in his Preface that Catholics use the terms to designate Protestantism as well as scepticism and infidelity. In the body of his Lectures, Mr. Farrar has, with that fairness and exactness which generally characterize his literary statements, described the leading articles of that Christian faith which some of us hold as the result of our free thought. We quote his words as the best proof we can give that a rational Christianity is possible, and that free thought is not necessarily hostile to pure religion.

"The great majority of doubters are persons who not only retain a tenacious grasp over monotheism, but even possess a love for Christianity. Their love is however for a modified form of it, different from that which the apostles taught. They cordially believe that God cares for man, and that He has spoken to man through His Son. They accept the superhuman, perhaps the divine, character of Christ; but they consider his life to be a mere example of unrivalled teaching, and of marvellous self-sacrifice; his death the mere martyrdom that formed the crowning act of majestic self-devotion. God's gift of His Son is accordingly, in their view, to reconcile man to God; to remove the obstacle of distrust which prevented man from coming to God, by showing forth the love which God already bore to the world; not to remove obstacles, known or unknown, which prevented God from showing mercy to man. Christ is accepted as a teacher, and as a king, but not as a priest. His work is viewed as having for its purpose, to inculcate and embody a higher type of morality, not to work out a scheme of redemption. The ethical element of Christianity becomes elevated above the dogmatic. The sermon on the mount is regarded as the very soul of Christ's teaching. And in looking forward to the future of Christianity, the Christian religion is considered likely to become the religion of the world, merely because it will have ceased to be the religion of form and dogma, and become the highest type of ethics."—Pp. 508, 509.

Mr. Farrar adds that the compatibility of these views with Christianity is by some defended on the ground that primitive Christianity was such a religion as he describes. He regards the attempt thus to defend them as "bold." It is so in the face of an united but unreasonable orthodoxy; but that is no reason why the views should not be true.

Considering the relation which Mr. Farrar conceives to exist between free thought and infidelity, we ought, we suppose, to feel not ungrateful for the moderation of his tone when he comes to speak of Unitarianism. His knowledge is chiefly at second-hand and imported from German writers. We cannot of course admit that his account of the genesis of Unitarianism is correct. Its authors were those of the Bible—not, as he suggests, the Jewish Gnostics. Of the early history of Unitarianism in England, Mr. Farrar knows little. He erroneously speaks of the seventeenth century as its first stage in England, and mentions the names of two Unitarian martyrs, affixing 1611 as the date of their martyrdom. The persons named are Matthew Hamont and John Lewes; but the former suffered in 1579, and the latter in 1583, both in the city of Norwich. There were, it is true, Unitarian martyrs in England in 1612 (not 1611),—Bartholomew Legate, burnt at Smithfield, and Edward Wightman at Lichfield. Mr. Farrar concedes to us some great names as connected with the eighteenth century, specifying “Lardner, Lowman and Priestley.” His words may be understood to imply that they arose out of the Presbyterians; but the first and the last really sprung from the English Independents. Our readers will be interested to learn in what light the Bampton Lecturer views the Unitarianism of the present day.

“Its last form is a modification of the old Socinian view, formed under the pressure of evangelical religion on the one side and rationalist criticism on the other. The accomplished writers, Channing in America and Mr. J. Martineau in England, are the best types of this form. Priestley, Channing, and Martineau, are the examples of the successive phases of modern Unitarianism: Priestley, of the old Socinianism building itself upon a sensational philosophy; Channing, of the attempt to gain a larger development of the spiritual element; Martineau, of the elevation of view induced by the philosophy of Cousin, and the introduction of the idea of historical progress in religious ideas.”—P. 556.

If Mr. Farrar were familiar\* with the various forms of thought included within the free thought of Unitarianism, he would know that there are many who hold firmly their Unitarian faith on the ground both of scripture and reason, caring little for the philosophical opinions which eminent Unitarians have adopted both in the last and in the present century. They would deny the accuracy of the statement that Priestley built his religious doctrines on a sensationalist philosophy, and would also repudiate the idea of any necessary alliance between their Christian faith and modern philosophy, whether that of Cousin or Hamilton.

---

\* As an illustration of Mr. Farrar's limited knowledge respecting Unitarians, we may allude to his statement that the late Mr. Charles Hennell, the author of “Christian Theism,” published in 1852, was a “Unitarian minister.” Mr. Hennell was in early life a Unitarian worshiper, but always as a layman. Largely as we dissent from his anti-supernaturalism, we remember his personal excellence with regard and admiration.



We proposed to ourselves, when commencing this article, to give an analysis of Mr. Farrar's work; but the attempt, even though aided by the author's prefatory analytical sketch of more than twenty pages, has resulted in so dry and profitless a skeleton of the book, that we put it aside and content ourselves with a brief enumeration of the subjects discussed in the several lectures. We the more readily do this as we desire to preserve in our pages a specimen or two of the very able descriptions of some of those who have really turned free thought into the channels of scepticism and infidelity.

In his first lecture he states his subject, describes and defends the historic method which he adopts, and, after expounding his philosophy of free thought and its development into unbelief, he dwells on the intellectual and moral advantages which he anticipates from the inquiry to which his work is devoted. The second lecture is a review of the several forms of heathen unbelief. The third gives us our author's views of the working of free thought during the middle ages and at the waking up of the European mind at the Reformation. The fourth lecture is devoted to the early Deists in England. The fifth continues the subject of English Deism, and also describes the infidelity of France during the last century. The sixth and seventh discuss the exercise of free thought in Germany, and bring up to the present time the infidelity of France. The last lecture is devoted to the more recent development of free thought in England, and to statements and warnings which the author deduces from his entire subject. More than a hundred pages of illustrative notes, some of them giving useful lists of books of reference, close a volume which, whatever be the amount of his agreement with the views disclosed, no intelligent person can read without considerable and well-sustained interest.

The account of Celsus in the second lecture is more rhetorical and therefore less satisfactory than some other portions of the lectures. Mr. Farrar omits to notice the injury done to the cause of Christianity by the suppression and loss of the works of the early opponents of Christianity. What we know of the book of Celsus entitled "The True Word," is gleaned from Origen's answer to it. Fortunately the Christian Father quoted largely from the work he sought to confute. Not many of the objections of this Epicurean philosopher (Mr. Farrar would from internal evidence rather class him among the Platonists) are such as modern objectors to Christianity would care to urge. But there is a most important fact deducible from the fragments of Celsus which are happily preserved to us. It is that he rehearses in his argument nearly all the incidents connected with the life and ministry of Jesus. If the date commonly assigned to Celsus be correct, about twenty years before the close of the second century, we reach the conclusion, quite independently of Chris-

tian writers, that the gospel narratives were in the time of Celsus substantially what we now have. This argument we owe to the exercise of that free thought which in the second century strove to confute Christianity.

More justice is done by Mr. Farrar to Porphyry, whose "critical acuteness" he freely admits:

"His objections are not, it will be observed, founded on quibbles like those of Celsus, but on instructive literary characteristics, many of which are greatly exaggerated or grossly misinterpreted, but still are real, and suggest difficulties or inquiries which the best modern theological critics have honourably felt to demand candid examination and explanation." P. 86.

Mr. Farrar, in the case of Porphyry (and the same thing we have noticed in other parts of his work), passes hastily over some objections which are essentially philosophical and just, but which when examined appear, to us at least, to be directed against misconceptions and corruptions, rather than against Christianity itself. Of this kind is the objection founded on the late publication of Christianity. If there be no salvation out of the pale of Christianity, if heathens especially are shut out of that evangelical heaven which was never revealed to them, we know not how the justice of God in so long delaying that needed light can be vindicated. The remark made respecting the writings of Celsus is still more forcible in connection with Porphyry, whose writings were suppressed by Theodosius under the influence of a timid but mischievous piety.

The sketch of Julian which Mr. Farrar gives is brief but spirited. In reading it, we are reminded more than once that the policy which this subtle heathen pervert adopted towards the Christians, resembled, and at more points than one, that by which orthodox Christians of a later age have striven to repress free thought. He declared the Christian laity disqualified for office in the state. Here was a type of the Test and Corporation Acts. "Afraid of the engine of education, he forbade Christian professors to lecture in the public schools of science and literature." This is the policy of the men who would not only forbid Dissenters from teaching, but even from learning, in the national seats of education. What but this is the policy of those who would drive an accomplished scholar like Mr. Jowett from his post, or at least starve him if he cannot be driven? Bolingbroke, who in some things resembled the Emperor Julian, would by his noted Schism Act (from the practical infamy of which the accession of the present Royal Family happily saved the country) have gone beyond his prototype.

No greater light rises in the history of free thought than Benedict Spinoza. His name brings us to the first contact of Christianity with modern science. Mr. Farrar's treatment of the subject is guarded (in some respects timid), yet able. We



have not room for the whole of his account of Spinoza, but select those passages which are most likely to interest our readers.

"Spinoza's memory has been branded with the stigma which attached to his character during life. Born in Holland, of Jewish origin, his early repudiation of the legends of the Talmud in which he was educated, caused his excommunication by his own people. Finding himself an outcast, he sought society among a few sceptical friends, one of whom was a physician named Van den Ende, whom a sense of injustice united to him by the bond of common sympathy. His life was passed in retirement, in hard, griping poverty. Possessing a mind of great originality, and a fondness for demonstrative reasoning never surpassed, he lived a model of chaste submissive virtue, searching for speculative truth; branded as an atheist in philosophy while living, and regarded since his death as the parent of many of the worst forms of rationalism in religion. Yet his character is one that cannot fail to excite a certain kind of pity. Unlike the frivolous selfish atheism, the immoral Epicureanism, of the French unbelief of the following century, his investigations were grave, his tone dignified, his temper gentle, his spirit serious. It is to be feared that he did not worship God; but he at least worshipped, at the cost of social martyrdom, what he thought to be truth. If he did not believe in revealed religion, he at least tried to embody what he believed to be its moral precepts. Though we may shrink with horror from his teaching, we cannot, when we compare him with other unbelievers, withhold our pity from the teacher.

"His works are short, but weighty. Of his important treatises, the one, the *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, shows him as the Biblical critic; the other, the *Ethica*, exhibits his philosophy."—Pp. 149, 150.

After describing the philosophical system of Descartes and the great obligations of Spinoza to that distinguished man, our lecturer speaks of the apparent Pantheistic character of Spinoza's views, and then proceeds thus:

"Spinoza, though a Jew, had examined the claims of Christianity. Indeed the discussions, half political half religious, of the Dutch theology, would have compelled the investigation of it, independently of his own largeness of sympathy with the philosophical history of human religion. His philosophy of revealed religion is contained in his *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*. . . .

"It is in the survey of Judaism and Christianity in the earlier part of this work that he exhibits the views in which he has anticipated many of the speculations of rationalism. He examines first into the grounds which Revelation puts forward for its claim to authority, viz. prophecy, the Jewish polity, and miracles; next the principles of interpretation, and the canon of the two Testaments; lastly, the nature of the divine teaching; endeavouring to show that the fundamental articles of faith are given in natural religion. In this way he exhibits his views on those branches which are now denominated the evidences, exegesis, and doctrines. . . .

"He examines the several books of scripture, and concludes from supposed marks of editorship that the Pentateuch and historical books were all composed by one historian, who was, he thinks, probably Ezra,

Deuteronomy being the first composed. The prophetic books he resolves into a collection of fragments. . . .

"The book marks an epoch, a new era in the critical and philosophical investigation of religion. Spinoza's ideas are as it were the head waters from which flows the current which is afterwards parted into separate streams. If viewed merely as a specimen of criticism, they are in many respects very defective. For this branch was new in Spinoza's time. Learning had been directed since the Renaissance rather to the acquisition of stores of information concerning ancient literature than reflective examination of the authenticity and critical value of the sources. Yet Spinoza's sagacity is so great, that the book is suggestive of information, and fertile in hints of instruction to readers who dissent most widely from his inferences. In Spinoza's own times the work met with unbounded indignation. Indeed hardly any age could have been less prepared for its reception. So rigorous a theory of verbal inspiration was then held, that the question of the date of the introduction of the Hebrew vowel points was discussed under the idea that inspiration would be overthrown, if the admission was made that they were introduced after the time of the closing of the canon. The tone of fairness in Spinoza's manner, which compels most modern readers to believe in his honesty, and which presents so striking a contrast to the profaneness of subsequent scepticism, was then regarded as latent irony. The work on its appearance was suppressed by public authority; but it was frequently reprinted; and probably no work of free thought has ever had more influence, both on friends and foes, except the memorable work of Strauss in the present age. Not only have free-thinkers been moulded by it, but it has produced lasting effects on those who have loved the faith of Christ. For Spinoza's work, if it did not create, gave expression to the tendency of which slight traces are perceptible elsewhere, to recognize a large class of facts relating to the personal peculiarities of the inspired writers, and to the 'human element,' as it has been frequently called, in scripture, for which orthodox criticism has always subsequently had to find a place in a theory of inspiration; facts which first shook the mechanical or verbal theory, which, however piously intended, really had the effect of degrading the sacred writers almost into automatons, and regarded them as the pens instead of the penmen of the inspiring Spirit. Indirectly the effect of Spinoza's thought was seen even in the English church. The difficulties which, through means of the English deists, it brought before the notice of the great apologetic writers of our own country, created the free, but perhaps not irreverent theory of revelation manifested in the churchmen of the last century, which restricted the miraculous assistance of inspiration to the specific subject of the revealed communication, the religious element of scripture, and did not regard it as comprehending also the allusions, scientific or historic, extraneous to religion."—Pp. 154—160.

We have characterized Mr. Farrar's critical estimate of Spinoza as timid. It is true, he can quote great names in support of the view he has taken of Spinoza. But it is more than probable that some changes will ere long be made in the opinions of thinking men respecting this great philosophical writer. That the charge of atheism with which his memory has been branded



is essentially false, we cannot doubt. That Spinoza was very dogmatic in his philosophy, and that his vigorous understanding was again and again caught in the meshes of his own subtle metaphysical speculations, is true of him as it is of many other philosophers; but he was no atheist. His Pantheism was little more than an apparent conclusion from some of his philosophical dogmas. It never touched his heart or debased his morals. We cannot for a moment admit the justice of Mr. Hallam's critical censure (*History of Literature*, Vol. IV.), that he was a mere reasoning machine; and that for the sake of his philosophy, he gave up every principle of religion and moral right. On such a subject, the explanation and defence of the accused man is surely entitled to attention. Charges of this kind were made against Spinoza during his life, and were denied by him in terms which indicate at least his sincerity. In one of his letters (the 49th in his *Posthumous Works*), he thus defends himself from the charge of having divested himself of all religion:

"Does he cast off religion who rests all he has to say on the subject, on the ground that God is to be acknowledged as the Supreme Good, that He is with entire singleness of soul to be loved as such; and that in loving God consists our highest bliss, our best privilege, our most perfect freedom? Further, that the reward of virtue is virtue, and the penalty of incapacity and baseness is ignorance and abjectness of spirit? Still further, that every one is bound to love his neighbour as himself, and to obey the laws of the land in which, and the authority under which, he lives? Now all this I have not only insisted on as impressively as I could in words, but I have further adduced the most cogent reasons that presented themselves to me in support of my conclusions."

In the same letter, in explanation of his supposed Pantheism, he says, that to maintain that all happens necessarily from the nature of God, is a proposition quite different from holding that the universe is God. And against the charge of being indifferent to the virtue of mankind and their obedience to God, he thus nobly defends himself:

"In the whole of my *Tractate* I aver that you will find no word to this effect. On the contrary, I declare expressly (*vide Chap. IV.*) that the sum of the divine law, the law that is written on our hearts and minds by the hand of God (*vide Chap. II.*), consists in this especially,—that we love God as our supreme good, not through fear of punishment, for love knows nothing of fear and cannot flow from fear, not even from love of aught else that we might wish to enjoy, but wholly and solely from devotion to the Supreme; for were this not the rule, we should then love God less than the thing desired. I have further shown in the same place that this is the very law which God revealed to the prophets; and if I now maintain that this law receives its character of commandment from God, or if I comprehend it in the way I comprehend the other decrees of God as involving an eternal truth, an eternal necessity in itself, it still remains an ordinance of the Almighty, and is doctrine wholesome to mankind. Even so, whether I love God of my own free

will or by the necessity of the divine decree, I still love the Creator and am blessed."\*

Spinoza and Milton were contemporaries, and against both the charge of neglecting the worship of God was brought. We now know why Milton did not join in public worship. He had outgrown the Trinitarian doctrines of his contemporaries. And even at Amsterdam, noted as it was for its religious freedom, a Christian holding the sublime religious philosophy of Spinoza could in the later part of the seventeenth century have found no worshipping assembly prepared to adopt a simple creed like his.

It would be not uninteresting were we able to follow Mr. Farrar in his treatment of the several English Deistical writers from Lord Herbert of Cherbury downwards. Of Lord Herbert, his account is essentially fair. He was the first distinctly to make religion a matter of individual intuition. The religion which he deduced from his natural instincts, as far it went, resembled that of intelligent and liberal Christians. Mr. Farrar does not notice the singular fact that Herbert's first work, that entitled "*De Veritate*," in which he asserted the sufficiency, universality and absolute perfection of natural religion, bore the licence of the chaplain of the Bishop of London. The free thought of this chivalrous knight had no effect in intercepting the confidence of both James and Charles; from the latter monarch he received his admission to the peerage.

An interesting chapter in the history of free thought might be written respecting those who have been unbelievers, not in Christianity itself, but in its corruptions. In respect to the outbreak of Deism in the eighteenth century, it should not be forgotten that it was in part the protest of a rational love of liberty against the extravagant pretensions of the priesthood, and in part of the understanding against an unreasonable theology maintained equally by the Puritan and the High-church party in England. Mr. Farrar thus eloquently speaks of the subsequent infidelity of France :

"The view entertained concerning deity was eventually grovelling; the greatness of nature seemed to inspire no reverence. Unbelief gradually lost hold of monotheism; and in doing so never ascended in grandeur to the idea of pantheism, but fell into blank atheism. The theoretical morality of the English deists, even when depending on expedience, was noble; but in place of it the French school presented the lowest form of theory which ethical science has ever stated, and which finds its refutation with the philosophy that gave it birth.

"No age exhibits a body of sceptical writers whose characters are so

---

\* We are indebted for these passages to the anonymous translator of the *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, whose volume has recently been published by Messrs. Trübner. We recommend that work to attention, without committing ourselves to all the matters introduced in the translator's prefatory statement. His Introduction would have been more useful if he had made it more definite and less declamatory.



unattractive as the French unbelievers; whose coarseness of mind in failing to appreciate that which is beautiful in Christianity is so evident, that charity could not forbid us to doubt, even if there were not independent proof, that faults of character contributed very largely to the formation of their unbelief. Nevertheless, the political aspect of the movement carries a solemn warning to the Christian church, not to endanger the everlasting Gospel of the Son of God by making it the buttress to support corrupt political and ecclesiastical institutions. It is true that Christ will not abandon his true church. Whatever is divine and eternally true will always as in this case survive the catastrophe. But this period of history shows that Providence will not work a miracle to save religion from a temporary eclipse, if the church forgets that Christ's kingdom is not of this world; and that the mission which he has given it is to convert souls to him; and that learning and piety are intellectual and moral means for effecting this object. The political faults or shortcomings of the church are no apology for the infidelity of France; but they must be taken into account in explaining its intensity."—Pp. 272, 273.

Infidelity is the natural reaction of the understanding against superstition and priestcraft. It is generally a mere temporary state, for man's soul cannot live without a religion and a faith. But the principle involved in the words of our lecturer may be applied to other cases than those of "corrupt political and ecclesiastical institutions." It may also, and with equal certainty, be applied to all gross corruptions of Christian doctrine. Against these, the inroads of free thought must eventually be successful. But the result will be a pure gain to religion, which will gain in strength what it loses in bulk.

Mr. Farrar's sketch of Theodore Parker is executed with considerable power, and is not without the needful discrimination.

"In early life a unitarian minister, he caught the spirit of intellectual inquiry and reconsideration which Channing had excited; and devoted himself with indefatigable industry to study the modern philosophy and criticism of Germany, until he became one of the most learned men of the American continent. In his own country his fearless and uncompromising denunciation of slavery, as well as of political and commercial hollowness, caused him to be viewed as a social reformer rather than a theological teacher. In ours he is viewed as a teacher of deism. The cause of his power is obvious. Feeling that his mission was not merely to pull down, but to build up, he spoke with the vigour of a dogmatist, not with the coldness of a critic. To a burning eloquence and native wit he united the picturesque power of the novelist or the artist. But his vigour of style was deformed by a power of sarcasm which often invested the most sacred subjects with caricature and vulgarity; a boundless malignity against supposed errors. How different is the tone of his satire from the delicate touches of the modern French critic (E. Renan) who was named in the last lecture! and yet, on the other hand, how changed from that of the infidel writers of the last century. Though he equals Paine in vulgarity, and Voltaire in sarcasm, his spirit and moral

tone are higher. They wrote, actuated by a bitter spirit against the Christian religion, without earnestness, without religious aspirations, with the coldness of unbelievers: he, with the earnestness of a preacher touched with the deepest feelings; and though the Christian writer will shudder at his remarks as much as at theirs, yet he sees them modified by passages of pathetic sentiment, in which, in words unrivalled in sceptical literature, admiration is expressed of Christ, of Christianity, and of scripture.

"Such was the man as a teacher. What was his doctrine? He sought and found in the human faculties the test of truth, not dwelling, like Strauss, on their tendency to deceive; but, like Schelling, on their certitude. He placed the ground of religion on the emotional side of the soul, in the feeling of dependence; and correlatively, on the intellectual side, in the intuitions of God, the moral law, and immortal life.

"Assuming, on the principle of spiritual supply and demand, that capacity proves object, (the natural realism which we attribute to the senses being thus applied to the intellectual instincts,) he regarded the intuitions to be real, and traced the mode in which reasoning and experience develop them into conceptions. But, afraid of giving too anthropomorphic a form to his conception of deity, he fell almost into the abstract conception of the English deists; and in the notion of God's general providence, lost the fatherlike conception of the divine Being with which the human analogy invests Him. Few nobler attacks however on atheism, or defences of the benevolent character of the divine Being, exist, than those which he has supplied. But at this point the Christian must altogether part company with him; for he next proceeded to argue against the possibility of miracle or special providence; identifying inspiration with the utterance of human genius, and regarding Christianity merely as the best exponent of man's moral nature; as one form of religion, but not the final one. The Bible, which as a collection of literary works, the religious literature of a Semitic people, he appreciated with enthusiastic admiration, was degraded from its position of a final authoritative utterance of religious truth, and was regarded as the embodiment of the thoughts of spiritual men of old time who were striving after truth, and spoke according to the light which they possessed. The religion which he taught was called by him 'the absolute religion.' It was merely deism, built on a sounder basis, and spiritualized by contact with a truer philosophy."—Pp. 457—460.

We cannot praise as highly his less elaborate sketch of Mr. W. R. Greg's Creed of Christendom. That of Mr. F. W. Newman is, we think, both fair and able; but we have no space left that will enable us to quote it.

Before parting with this work, we would express the deliberate conviction that its author has striven to perform his critical task as justly as he possibly could, consistently with the dogmatic limits which he had assigned to himself. In the present state of the Church of England, it is a delicate matter for a clergyman pledged to implicit assent and consent to certain dogmas, to write moderately and fairly respecting those who impugn the dogmatic foundations of his Church. With the fate of Dr. Rowland Williams before him, the critical historian of Free



Thought in England must have felt at every step that he was treading on hot ashes and dangerous pitfalls. If he preserved the impartiality due to history, his orthodoxy was liable to imputations. If he perpetually stopped his narrative to mark and reprobate every deviation from what his Church decrees to be the true faith, he destroyed the literary merit of his book. That in avoiding Scylla, our theological navigator has always kept clear of Charybdis, we do not assert. But we give him credit for the intention and the effort to be impartial and fair.

There is one consideration that is cheering. Earlier in the century, some of the road over which Mr. Farrar has passed was trod in the Boyle Lectures by one of his predecessors in the Bampton Lecture, Dr. Van Mildert. With the unrelenting bigotry of Church infallibility, he assigned everything which he chose to call heresy and unbelief to the direct agency of the evil spirit striving to thwart the truth of God. This Manichean theory is a convenient but a dangerous weapon. Mr. Farrar is too wise to adopt it; and whatever use may be made of it privately by those hostile to free thought, we do not now fear its being resorted to by any respectable Protestant apologist of orthodoxy. It is a weapon which a fanatic like Huntington, the Sinner Saved, or popular theological quacks like Cumming and Spurgeon, may use, as well as an accredited and learned champion of orthodoxy.

The spirit of the Bampton Lecturer of 1862 shews that no inconsiderable advance has been made in the last half century in the mode of conducting a theological argument. So far as Mr. Farrar is in this matter in contrast with Bishop Van Mildert, we hope he may not suffer by exposure to orthodox jealousies and resentments.

---

#### THE FOUNDATION OF THE CHURCH.

ST. PAUL treats of the foundation doctrine of the gospel which he preached in 1 Cor. iii. 10—15, a passage which may be fitly assumed as the groundwork of some farther remarks on the same subject. He says, "*According to the grace of God given unto me, as a skilful master-builder, I have laid the foundation, and another is building thereupon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon. For other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver and costly stones, or wood, hay and stubble, every man's work shall be made manifest; for time will shew it. For it shall be revealed by fire, and the fire will test every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a recompence; but if any man's work shall be burnt, he will lose his labour; yet he*

*himself shall escape, though as it were through a fire.*" This language is metaphorical, yet easily understood. St. Paul says that he had laid the foundation of Christianity among the Corinthians by preaching Jesus as "*the Christ.*" He had not rested his doctrine on himself or his own opinion; he had not rested it even on Jesus of Nazareth, considered as an individual person: but on Jesus considered as "*the Christ,*" the anointed of God. This is the only sure foundation. It is no doubt true that on this foundation different men may erect different structures. One may build upon it a palace or a temple, with walls of costly marble, adorned with statues and decorations of gold and silver. Another may erect upon it a poor hovel, with walls of wood and roof of thatch. But time will test the stability of each. Even without much length of time, the breaking out of a fire may shew it. If the edifice be durable, the builder will receive the price agreed upon for his work; if it be consumed, he will lose his pains. Yet if he has been an honest though mistaken man, he shall not perish with his work; he shall make his escape, though with grief and pain, like a man who rushes out of a house when it is in flames. The sum of the whole is that the fundamental doctrine of Christianity is that *Jesus is the Christ.* Without this, there can be no Christianity at all. On this fundamental doctrine one man may erect a true and wholesome system of religion and morals; if so, it will endure, and he will be rewarded for his labour. Another, though equally honest, may build upon the same groundwork a system of erroneous opinions and practices. Such mistaken doctrines will in time come to nothing; but yet the man who has broached them, if he be a sincere and true man, though ever so far mistaken, shall not perish finally; he shall be saved; though, in comparison with the other, his escape may be compared to that of a man who makes his way through the midst of a conflagration.

It is evident from this whole passage, but more especially from the 11th verse, "*Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ,*" that St. Paul regarded the Christship of Jesus as the one, but at the same time as the *indispensable*, basis of the whole system of the gospel. In his view, it is all grounded on one great principle that Jesus is the Christ, the anointed of God, the divinely-commissioned ambassador through whom his will and purposes are revealed; and who, as such, possessed an authority which none besides could claim, to promulgate doctrines, and to establish ordinances or to abrogate them, in a manner binding upon the consciences of his followers.

That this was the apostle's idea of the fundamental principle of the gospel will not probably be disputed by any one. It may also be presumed that very few persons, whatever may be their opinions respecting the principle itself, will deny that a statement of this sort, coming from so eminent a man, is entitled to



be carefully considered by every one who desires to investigate the essential faith of the Christian church. No doubt there are persons who would refuse to be bound by any *dictum* of St. Paul; but it is probable that even among them there are few or none who would deny that the view of the gospel put forth by so early and so successful a propagator of Christianity deserves attention. Still to some inquirers it may be more satisfactory if we look beyond him, and consider the light in which this question is placed by other persons, whose statements must, in like manner, be regarded as carrying with them a certain share of importance. We do not at present assume the truth of their statements. We only propose to shew that certain statements were made at the very earliest period in the history of Christianity, and by persons who must be regarded as the best, or among the best, sources of knowledge respecting its nature, its history and its claims.

St. Peter must be ranked among these men; and we find from his discourse addressed to an assemblage of anxious inquirers respecting the doctrines and claims of Christianity, that he, in common with St. Paul, esteemed the key-stone of the whole system to be the great fact, or alleged fact, "*that God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with power,*" (Acts x. 38, &c.). The same thing he had previously expressed in other words: "*Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God,*" (Matt. xv. 16); and this confession was declared by Jesus himself to be the rock on which he would build his church. St. John declares that he wrote his gospel that his readers "*might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing, they might have life through his name,*" (John xx. 31). And Jesus himself declared it to be life eternal that men "*might know the Father to be the only true God, and himself to be the Christ whom the Father had sent,*" (John xvii. 4). Before the high-priest he declared himself to be "*the Christ, the Son of the Blessed.*" On this account he claimed to be the "*Master and Lord*" of the church, (John xiii. 13), and asserted that God had given him "*authority over all flesh,*" (John xvii. 2). He asserted that he was a king, though not after the manner of the kings of this world, and claimed every votary of the truth as his subject, (John xviii. 17). He asserted that unless his disciples should abide in him, they could no more bring forth fruit than could the branch of a vine when separated from the parent tree, (John xv. 4, &c.).

Now comes the question, Who is this respecting whom, and by whom, such things are said? Who and what is he who is thus declared to be the foundation and the hope of Christians? Who is this that takes it upon him to say that it is eternal life to know the Father to be the only true God, and himself to be the Christ whom God had sent? Who is this that in express terms claims to be the Master and the Lord of his followers; asserts dominion over their faith and authority over all flesh; and

who was ranked by the early disciples and first missionaries of the gospel "far above all principality and power and might and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world but also in the world to come?" Who and what is he, if these representations be truthful and trustworthy?

Is this the son of a carpenter at Nazareth in Galilee, *and nothing more*? Is he simply a young peasant of extraordinary sagacity, but unlettered and unlearned, who had studied in no school, and whose mind had never been enlightened or enlarged by an acquaintance with history, science and philosophy? And did the apostles go forth in the name of such an one, viewing him as possessing no higher claim on their allegiance than these suggestions express, to overturn all the systems of religion then subsisting in the world; to subvert all its schools of philosophy; to revolutionize its whole social policy; to establish a new civilization in the room of that which was then regarded as the perfection of human wisdom applied to the great problems of life? Was it in the name of this young man that they went forth to subjugate the human race to a set of ideas which had sprung up spontaneously in his untutored brain? Surely no one will think so; that is to say, no one will think that they thought so. Unquestionably they went forth to preach in the name of Jesus; but they believed that a power mightier far than his or their own dwelt in him and was with them. They did not preach in the name of Jesus, viewed as an individual merely; but in the name of *Jesus, the Christ*. They laid as the foundation-stone of the church which they were engaged in building, the doctrine that "*Jesus is the Christ*." His divine commission they constantly affirmed in their speeches, their conversations, their epistles. If any man expressed his concurrence in this affirmation, they received and acknowledged him as a brother. If any man rejected their testimony, they neither hated him nor reviled him; they left him, as was right, free to follow what he regarded as truth, free to reject what he conceived to be error. They left him free to follow his light as they followed theirs. But they never dreamed of acknowledging such a man as a Christian, or, what is the same, as a disciple of Christ. The first step that the convert had to make on entering the church was over the threshold, on which was inscribed, "*Jesus, the Christ*." If he stumbled there, he never could be admitted into the interior of the building. No man who has ever read the New Testament will deny that the profession of belief in Jesus as the Christ was the test whereby the fitness of candidates for reception into the church was decided in the times of which it treats. Whatever was the truth or falsehood of that assertion of the divine authority of the Founder of the system, it is indisputable that the claim was made, and that the acknowledgment of it was the very basis on which the church was built. Whosoever acknowledged that claim was



himself acknowledged as a disciple. Whosoever rejected it was himself rejected from the fold of "the one Shepherd." This was in those days the fundamental doctrine of Christianity.

And it is so still. What Christianity was at the beginning, it is now and it will be till the end of time. The doctrine of Jesus is "the same yesterday, to-day and for ever." If it was originally a *myth*, it is not now a fact. If at first it was an *imposture*, a "cunningly-devised fable," the lapse of ages has not converted it into a system of truth and purity. If at the beginning it was but the *dream of a hot-brained enthusiast*, who mistook his own ravings for the suggestions of a divine inspiration, and who had no call to the work of evangelizing the world but that which originated in his own diseased imagination, nothing that has occurred in the 1800 years which have since rolled past can have transmuted it into the "words of truth and soberness." If it was a system of *moral philosophy*, thought out in the mind of a Jewish mechanic, and by him propounded as the best result of his meditations on God and man, sin and virtue, joy and sorrow, time and eternity, it is impossible that it can have acquired any higher character than it possessed at first. If, on the other hand, Jesus "did not speak of himself," but the Father who dwelt in him "gave him a *commandment* what he should say and what he should speak," its divine authority has not been forfeited or lost. If ever it was a real revelation, it remains so for ever.

It seems impossible to frame a sixth hypothesis. The foundation remains the same as it was at the first. The gospel must either be a myth, or a fraud, or a dream, or a philosophical discovery, or a divine faith, "the power of God and the wisdom of God." There seems no other way of accounting for its origin.

Of these theories, the first three are those which are most commonly embraced by avowed opponents of the gospel. We do not dispute their right to hold, to avow, and, if they think it proper, to propagate their opinions. They have as much right to express their dissent from Christianity as we have to proclaim our conviction of its truth. But we hope it is not uncharitable to say that we hold them to be very far mistaken. We are sure that no honest man who thinks that Jesus was but a mythical person who never really existed, or who believes him to have been an artful deceiver or a self-deluded enthusiast, would wish to be ranked among his disciples, or would complain of us because we say distinctly that we cannot consider any such person to be a Christian. The man who so believes may be a most excellent and worthy person; he may be a very able and a very learned man, far more able and far more learned than we. He may be a very honest man. He may be an amiable and excellent man, in many respects a pattern to all. But if he looks upon Christ in any of these lights, assuredly he is no believer in him nor in his gospel. Indeed, no man looking upon Jesus in any of these

lights could honestly desire to take upon himself the name of a disciple of Christ. If he wishes to do so, it must be from some worldly and unworthy motive. He may be influenced by a desire to gain or to retain some office for which he would otherwise be disqualified. He may wish to acquire the favour of some one whose good opinion he would forfeit by renouncing the profession of Christianity. Or he may have some other selfish end in view. But so far as he acts under the influence of such motives, he is not an honest man. His life is a tissue of falsehood, one continued lie; and his inward soul must revolt against the hypocrisy which he is daily and hourly practising.

With regard to the fourth of the theories above suggested, it is necessary to enter somewhat more into detail.

There have appeared at various times in nominally Christian lands, but perhaps of late more prominently than in former times, persons who, though they look upon Christ in no other light than as a human religious reformer and moral philosopher, yet claim to be considered as his disciples, because, as they say, they are willing to *learn* of him; that is, to embrace as many of his doctrines as they believe to be true, and to imitate as much of his example as they believe to be praiseworthy. They do not acknowledge his claim to any divine commission or authority. Some of them are very open and candid in renouncing all profession of allegiance to him. One or two may be found who even ostentatiously trample on his claim to any authority in the church more than they possess themselves, or more than any man may acquire by faithfully exerting his talents for the discovery of truth. Others are more cautious in avowing these sentiments, but really hold them, and take every opportunity of eulogizing the persons by whom such views have been propounded, and zealously co-operate in diffusing the publications in which such tenets are enforced.

It is a sufficient answer to these persons to say that there never was such a Christianity as that which they desire to inculcate, and which they represent as the only rational system of belief. From the very date of its appearance, the gospel claimed to be a divine faith, not a mere human opinion. We know this not merely from the testimony of Christian writers ever since the days of the apostles, but from the edicts which were launched against Christianity by emperors and kings, and from the writings of the philosophers among the heathens and the rabbis among the Jews, who drew their pens in opposition to the new faith. It was assailed as a faith which claimed a supernatural origin and an exclusive authority. The apologists who pleaded for it defended it on the same ground. There never was a time since the Scriptures of the New Testament appeared, in which they were not received and held in veneration as writings of the highest authority, giving a faithful account of the life and discourses of



Jesus Christ, whose teachings were regarded as the very rule and standard of faith; and everybody knows that there is not a book in the whole collection which does not testify that the foundation of the whole system is the Messiahship of Jesus. If any man were to cut out of the New Testament all the parts which ascribe to Jesus a divine commission and miraculous endowments, he would scarcely leave a square inch of paper between its covers. An eminent writer endeavoured, some time ago, to recommend the formation of a church whose bond of union should be the consent of its members to imitate the character of Jesus, passing over, as it seems, *designedly*, all faith in his divine mission. But under such a process as we have described, the character of Jesus would melt into thin air. For example: in the history of Christ there are few points which have excited more, or more just, admiration than the tenderness which he displayed on his visit to Martha and Mary after the death of their brother. But if we are to act in the manner suggested, that whole narrative must be discarded; for it all turns on the supernatural fact of the raising of Lazarus from the dead. Who does not delight to dwell on the beautiful and affecting interview of Jesus with the widow of Nain? But this too must be thrown aside for a similar reason. We contemplate with intense admiration the Saviour weeping over the devoted Jerusalem; but this incident also is to be expunged, for it implies a foreknowledge of its approaching fate. We survey with mute astonishment the calm fortitude with which Christ announced to his disciples his agonizing death: "Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and the Son of Man shall be delivered to the chief priests and to the scribes, and they shall deliver him to the Gentiles to mock and scourge and crucify him, and the third day he shall rise again," (Matt. xx. 19). But here again the supernatural is interwoven with the narrative, constitutes a portion of its very substance, and cannot be disentangled from it; so that, according to the maxims of certain writers who call each other critical theologians, the whole must be thrown away as a silly legend, unworthy of a wise man's thought! By proceeding upon this principle—that is, accepting Christ only as a human reformer, and the gospel as nothing more than a human scheme of religious philosophy—we should speedily leave ourselves without a Christ from whom to learn, or a Christianity to accept. Trying to embrace the gospel in this sense, we should fling our arms around a cloud.

Some Christians have, without authority and without reason, multiplied the fundamental doctrines of the faith. They have made every opinion of their own sect, or every crotchet of their own fancy, to be an essential doctrine of the gospel. All who could not accept their fancied fundamentals they denounced as *not Christians*, and rejected as unfit for membership in the church. This process went on for centuries, until at last the pathway into

the edifice became as narrow as the bridge to the Mahometan paradise, of breadth less than that of a single hair. Orthodoxy is indeed a very narrow path, and a rough one, and infested with thorns and briars; a very unpleasant path it is for one who wishes to walk freely. How much better to imitate the psalmist, who says, "I will walk at liberty, for I seek thy statutes!"—the statutes of God. The fundamentals which sufficed for the apostle Paul in the first century, ought surely to be sufficient for us in the nineteenth, and he tells us, "Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is *Jesus Christ*." To accept Jesus as he is held forth in the New Testament, namely, as the Christ of God, is sufficient, so far as faith or belief is concerned, to constitute the man who so accepts him a Christian; and no man now living has a right to require more. What satisfied Christ himself ought assuredly to satisfy us.

Others are labouring hard to tear up the foundation on which the apostolic church was erected, denying that Jesus possessed any commission from God, or had any authority over the faith and consciences of men. His teachings, according to them, possess no force, except so far as our own judgments lead us to perceive the soundness of those views of religion and morals which he opened up. It is evident that these religionists rely, both primarily and ultimately, not on the word of Jesus, but on their own reason. The foundation on which they rest their faith is not his Messiahship, but their own logic. Not a few of these men are what are called *Spiritualists*. While they deny any special inspiration in Jesus Christ, some of them at times express themselves in a way which seems to imply that they believe themselves to be inspired. Yet they call themselves Christians, and think they are entitled to do so because there are *parts* of his doctrinal teaching with which they agree, and *portions* of his character as unfolded in the Gospels of which they approve; while they reject the greater part of these books as worthless legends.

Both these extremes, it seems to us, an humble follower of "the Christ" will carefully avoid. While he will, so long as he remains a Christian, conscientiously accept every tenet which he finds supported by the authority of the great Teacher, he will rank no tenets as fundamentals but those which are so ranked by Jesus himself and by the apostles whom he sent out to preach his gospel. While he will fearlessly investigate every fact and opinion which are tendered to him for acceptance, rejecting all that may appear to himself to be unauthorized and untrue, he will be careful to adhere to the great fundamental principle of the whole evangelical fabric, namely, that *Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, the foundation-stone and the head corner-stone of the church*.

For this plain statement of what seems to us a very plain principle, it is possible that we may be set down as narrow-



mind, bigoted, intolerant, &c. &c. &c. We have not to learn that some who take the liberty of setting aside the authority to which we bow with submission, occasionally indulge themselves in the liberty of affixing unpleasant epithets and imputing uncharitable motives to persons who do not see with their eyes and cannot read through their spectacles. But such things ought not to disturb for a moment the tranquillity of a wise man's spirit. We believe the main principle which has been briefly unfolded in this paper to be true. We believe it to be important. We believe it to be especially important at the present time and in the existing phase of the Unitarian church; and we shall not be deterred by any apprehension of such imputations from offering them to the consideration of our brethren in a common faith. With us it is matter of duty to put them forth frankly and explicitly. The reception with which they may meet is to us matter of secondary concern.

Ψ.

---

#### CANON STANLEY ON THE BIBLE.\*

HERE is, in small compass, one of the largest contributions to free Biblical theology that this age of Broad Churchism has produced. The pamphlet indeed (for it is but a pamphlet of about a hundred pages) scarcely fulfils the promise of its very comprehensive title; but it develops one great principle of Biblical interpretation, which, if fairly followed out, would soon enable all thoughtful Christians to understand what the Bible really is, both in Form and in Substance. It consists, in fact, of three admirable sermons on a text which, Dr. Stanley says, "has long appeared to him to contain not merely the best definition which the Bible contains of its own structure and contents, but also to give the best reply to many of the difficulties which have of late years beset the path of the theological student." That text is the opening sentence of the Epistle to the Hebrews: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners (or, *in many parts* and *in many modes*) spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son."

In the first sermon the preacher points out "the gradual, partial, progressive character of Revelation;" in the second, he dwells on the specialty of the Old-Testament Revelation as spoken "by the Prophets;" and in the third, on the specialty of the New as spoken "in His Son."

Now this text, in the nature of the case, cannot be *a definition*

---

\* The Bible: its Form and its Substance. Three Sermons before the University of Oxford. By Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, D.D., Reg. Prof. of Eccl. Hist., and Canon of Christ Church. Pp. 115. Parker, Oxford and London. 1862.

of the Bible, to which as a collective volume it has no reference ; but it is an admirable description indeed of the progressive character of those Revelations, the records of which are preserved in the Scriptures.

We shall do little more than present an abstract of these discourses, in which our readers will notice, with wonder only diminished by the increasing frequency of such a phenomenon, how easily a Church-of-England scholar can slide into a vein of thought long looked upon as heretical, and seem to forget all the orthodoxies which used to distinguish his theology from that of the Unitarians. The only seemingly orthodox term that occurs in the three sermons is, if we mistake not, *Incarnation* ; and that is used in a sense which would be generally considered quite unorthodox. The Preface (which is not the least remarkable part of the pamphlet) distinctly repudiates the "theory of a uniform and equal inspiration of every word and letter of the Bible," as being the modern Helvetic theory of the seventeenth century, unknown to the early Fathers and inconsistent with the facts of the Bible itself. On this fundamental question of Inspiration, Dr. Stanley quotes noble words from Arnold, and also from the *Aids to Faith* and *Replies* to the Essays and Reviews, the one volume published (as he takes care to remind us) "with the sanction of the present Bishop of Oxford, the other with the sanction and concurrence of the present Archbishop of York." Of these remarkable extracts he says indeed, "Some may be concessions reluctantly extorted, others may be inconsistent with what the writers have said elsewhere, or even in the immediate context ;" but he quotes them as a pledge and omen of peace, and also as a sign "that the treatment of the Bible according to a theory of literal inspiration which would make every theology impossible, can henceforth be no more imposed on the English Church." We know not whether Rowland Williams has said anything more free or reasonable on the subject than the passages here adopted by Canon Stanley from some of his ostensible opponents. Nor is it unworthy of remark that the authorities quoted in this Preface are completed by extracts from "the well-known language of two of the best among our living divines," but whose names Canon Stanley perhaps felt it would too much shock the clerical ear to mention just now ; for we recognize the extracts at once as occurring in the first and last of the *Essays and Reviews*, by Dr. Temple and Mr. Jowett respectively. Admirable extracts indeed they are, teaching us to find how unlike all other books the Bible is by studying it just as we do all others. Will the Court of Arches be invoked to apply one of its few and reluctant judgments to these Essayists and to Canon Stanley ?

The first discourse illustrates the *many parts* and *many modes* of Divine Revelation by comparing the Bible with the Koran. The Koran is uniform in style, reflecting the mind of only one



person; it is uniform in its scene and phase of society, uniform in language, uniform in materials, and consequently stationary. The Bible is the reverse of all this, with its many authors and varied scenes, its diversities of language and materials, and the diversity and progressiveness of its revelations. Hence the duty of distinguishing the most important from the comparatively unimportant of its contents. The prophets are the characteristic books of Judaism, important and valuable as the histories may be; and in the New Testament what God hath spoken by his Son is the centre of interest. The Gospels must therefore be ranked above the Epistles without disparagement to the latter. The preacher adds, without any evident coherence or clearness, that the Creeds of the Church have with similar discrimination made the Incarnation their leading doctrine:

“First and before all things learn the mind and spirit of Christ as set forth in the four Gospels. In that mind and spirit lies the true solution of all our disputes about the nature of the Infinite. In that mind and spirit lies the true key to all the mysteries of His life and death,—the meaning of His miracles, the salt of His words, the virtue of His sacrifice, the power of His resurrection. It was a true feeling which gave to our religion the name of that one single pre-eminent portion of the Sacred Volume—the GOSPEL. It was a true feeling which led the Fathers to take, as the subject of the Creeds, the one doctrine which above all others belongs to the Gospels, namely, the INCARNATION.”

Is there not a strange confusion here? Was our religion called the Gospel because it is contained in the gospel-histories? Or, were not these called the four Gospels because they contain our religion, which its Founder himself had announced as the gospel or *good news*? Of course it cannot be in the usual sense of the term *Incarnation* that the doctrine above all others belongs to the evangelists. Dr. Stanley's idea of it will presently appear.

Sermon II. explains how “*God spake by the Prophets*.” The prophet “stood on the highest step of the gradations of revelation” in the Old Testament. The histories are precious; but “God spake, not by the historians, geographers, chronologers, but in a special sense by the Prophets.”\* Even kings and priests bow to the authority of the prophet. It was the spirit of the prophetic order that “gave to the Jewish people that element of progression and elevation which is the best proof of the Divine authority of the Old Testament itself, and of its practical use for us.”

The very name *prophet* denotes its design: “the *boiling or bubbling over* of the Divine Fountain of Inspiration within the soul,”—an idea common to Jews and Greeks in some degree. In an Eastern nation (else stationary), such an institution was a

---

\* Yet those historians, geographers and chronologers are the *Prophetæ Priores* in the wide sense of the Hebrew word for *Prophet*.

guarantee for liberty, progress, protection from wrong and falsehood. "The Jews (says Mill) were, next to the Greeks, the most progressive people of antiquity, and, jointly with them, have been the starting-point and main propelling agency of modern civilization."

The prophets' teaching was threefold: *Respice, Aspice, Prospice*; Past, Present and Future. As teachers of the Past, we know little of them. Would that we could read the *Acts of David* as written by Nathan! But this and other biographies are lost, except as interwoven into the later narratives of Samuel and Kings, by comparing which with the Chronicles, we see the characteristics of the prophet as distinguished from the mere Levite chronicler.

As teachers of the Divine will in regard to the Present, the prophets proclaimed (1) the Unity of God, and (2) His Spirituality or Morality; i.e. His Justice, Goodness, Love. But this latter or "positive side of their teaching" received its highest development in the prophets of the New Testament. "Grace and Truth" were declared (in Isaiah) to be the only means of conceiving or approaching the Divine Essence. Christ "was himself the Incarnation of that Grace and Truth." "The doctrine of the Incarnation of Christ by the last of the prophets, St. John, is the fitting and necessary close of the glimpse of the moral nature of the Divinity revealed to the first of the prophets, Moses. This revelation of the Divine Essence, this manifestation of God in some unusually impressive form, constituted at once the first call and the sustaining force of every Prophetic Mission." Hence we understand our author's meaning connected with the word *Incarnation*. It is applicable to all the prophets in their degrees. It does not mean God becoming man, but God inspiring man. It means the "revelation of the Divine Essence." He proceeds further to illustrate the teaching of the prophets in reference to the Present. They upheld the moral above the ceremonial law, protesting from first to last against the one great corruption of religion, its separation from morality. These protests are largely quoted. Mercy and justice, truth, repentance, goodness,—not sacrifice and fasting,—is the burden of prophetic teaching in the Old Testament, and still more emphatically in the New. The chief warnings uttered by Christ himself were "against the ceremonial, the narrow, the religious world of that age. In His deeds, I need only refer to His death—proclaiming as the very central fact and doctrine of the New Religion, that sacrifice, henceforth and for ever, consists not in the blood of bulls and goats, but in the perfect surrender of a perfect Will and Life to the perfect Will of an All Just and All Merciful God." Let the reader mark well this description of Christ's sacrifice, and set it parallel to that before given of the Incarnation.

This supremacy of the moral above the ceremonial in the hands of the Jewish prophets, sets them in contrast to "all other sacred bodies which have existed in Pagan and, it must even be added, in Christian times. They were religious teachers without the usual faults of religious teachers." As such they are a fine example for the English clergy to copy:

"The spirit of the World asks, *first*, Is it safe, Is it pious? secondly, Is it true? The spirit of the Prophets asks, *first*, Is it true? secondly, Is it safe? The spirit of the World asks, *first*, Is it prudent? secondly, Is it right? The spirit of the Prophets asks, *first*, Is it right? secondly, Is it prudent?"

It was the peculiar work of the prophets to appeal to the consciences of the hearers; nor has this gift of insight into others' hearts altogether ceased among ourselves. Another characteristic of the old prophets was found in their relation to the state; they were often politicians; they were always patriots. They laboured to maintain a spirit of national unity in spite of the division of the monarchy. At different epochs, they assailed different institutions in the power of the same great moral and religious principles, always protecting the oppressed and opposing the selfish, luxurious and insolent. Independence of soul characterized them. It was derived from two sources: their consciousness of the *presence of God*, and their constant looking forward to the *Future*.

And thus we come to the prophetic function in reference to the Future. The common error of regarding the prophet as a mere predictor could not have prevailed so widely without some ground of fact; and, in fact, the old Hebrew prophets "did in a marked and especial manner look forward to the future." This gave to the Jewish nation "an upward, forward, progressive character" peculiarly their own; it put into the Bible its "modern element,—so like our own times, so unlike the ancient framework of its natural form—that Gentile, European turn of thought,—so unlike the Asiatic language and scenery which was its cradle." Such are "the unmistakeable predictions of the Prophetic spirit of the Bible, the pledges of its inexhaustible resources."

The political predictions "are almost always founded on the denunciations of moral evil or the exaltation of moral good;" and they are often made contingent—as in Jonah's denunciation of Nineveh—though absolute in the terms in which they are uttered. The Messianic predictions are next considered. The Jewish people were remarkable as having their golden age not in the past, but in the future. Their King, Deliverer and Prophet was to come. The prophets were the chief exponents of this hope. It is a simple fact, that not only the Jews, but the whole Eastern world, did look forward for the coming Conqueror. Was this unparalleled expectation then realized? "A character



arose by universal consent as unparalleled as the expectation which had preceded him. Jesus of Nazareth was the greatest name, the most extraordinary power, that has ever crossed the stage of History." And his greatness consisted in the qualities chiefly emphasized by the prophets,—justice and love, goodness and truth. More generally yet, the preacher finds in the prophetic writings, predictions which form a ground of consolation to the Church, to individuals and to the human race. *The power of the Future* is that which gives to the Bible its hopeful and exultant character, distinguishing it from the morose, querulous, narrow and desponding spirit of many false religions. To the individual, the grand Bible prediction is the all-efficacy of repentance and reformation. The turn, the change from wrong to right, makes the Future to be thenceforth everything to us, the Past nothing. Then the great *Future* of the life to come, which to the prophets of old was almost shut out, those of the New Dispensation have predicted with unshaken certainty. The heathens guessed; the elder Hebrew prophets were content to acquiesce in the Divine will for life and death, not venturing to look further; but the Christian prophets "threw themselves boldly on the undiscovered world beyond the grave."

We now come to Sermon III.: "*God hath in these last days spoken unto us in His Son.*"

"The due proportion of faith" should be preserved if we would avoid heresies, extravagances and eccentricities in religion. "The task of rightly selecting the chief doctrine of our faith or of our theology is like the selection of the site for a capital city." "The revelation of Christ is the central doctrine of the Bible." "God spake by His Son in a sense far more divine than even by Moses, or David, or Isaiah." "There is a paramount and unapproachable superiority in the Revelation of God in Jesus Christ, above every other that He has ever vouchsafed to man." This consideration is important not only in comparing the new dispensation with the old, but also "in adjusting the value of the different parts of the Christian Revelation with each other." The Acts and the Epistles "are not the culminating points of the Christian Revelation." "The Four Gospels" are what contain THE GOSPEL. So (the preacher proceeds) in the Creeds of the early Church the Incarnation is the central truth, though in later ages other matters, as Predestination, Justification, &c., have assumed the leading place. Why is this so? he asks.

"What are the points which make it fitting and natural and full of instruction, that the most perfect Revelation of God should be that which is contained in His Son Jesus Christ? I do not profess to exhaust this great subject. I do not profess to defend or to establish the doctrine. I take it as it stands *in the Bible and in the Creeds*; and I ask you to consider the meaning of this striking and incontrovertible selection of the *Incarnation as the central truth of the Bible.*"

A Canon of the Church of England must be forgiven, we suppose, for joining the Bible and the Creeds in this partnership of seeming equality, and for clinging to the term Incarnation while he explains his own meaning to be "the Revelation of God in Jesus Christ." So without protesting further against the phrase, let us go on analyzing the thoughts developed from the text, *God hath spoken in His Son*. The preacher will shew the "paramount importance and significance" of this statement, and "its relations to the rest of our Christian belief."

"First (he says) the study of the Person, the Mind of Christ is thus, by the very force of the terms, the foundation of all Christian *theology* properly so called—that which tells of the nature of God. We want to know what is the voice of God. The Bible answers, 'It is the voice of Christ.'"

To know the essential characteristics of the Divine Nature, we must look at the life and character of Christ.

"Whatever is the most vital part of His Character, is the most vital part of the Nature of God. By seeing, as we must see, that the most vital part is the moral character,—the Will, the Wisdom, the Love, the Justice, the Compassion, the Forbearance,—we learn beyond any matter of doubt that these, according to the Bible, give the best conception we can form of the Divine Mind itself. These attributes of Christ, carried to the highest pitch, are, if the Bible and the Creeds speak true, of the very essence of Divinity. In adoring these, in adoring Him, we acknowledge that God is, above all other thoughts that we can have concerning Him, a Moral Being."

Here is indeed a true and noble exposition of the scripture doctrine of *God in Christ*, or *God speaking in His Son*. But that this is also the doctrine of the Creeds, and that it is the Creed doctrine of Incarnation, will scarcely seem clear even to Churchmen in general, though our author adds:

"In this way it is that, according to the profound remark of a late lamented theologian, one grand result of the Nicene decision was, the re-assertion of the moral character, of the moral perfection, of the Divine Nature."

We must confess ourselves unable to penetrate so profoundly into the non-apparent meaning of a dogmatical Creed which was levelled against the Arians. The preacher resumes his noble subject, that God is revealed in Christ; but presently he ceases really to illustrate the Divine Attributes by the comparison, if he does not rather confound the human and the divine by falling into the common language respecting Christ's double nature. It is, he says, by the Christ-like, and therefore God-like, moral qualities, rather than by power, wisdom, offerings, rites, or *correct belief*, that we can hold communion with the Father of Spirits. In this way we see that He is no abstraction or general law, but One whom we can love and who has loved us. Then he pursues, less clearly as it seems to us:

"Christ is our Example. But He is much more than our Example. The whole spirit of His appearance is even more fully designed to show us what God is, than to teach us what man ought to be. But we must not divide the two Natures; as though here we could trace a fragment of His Divinity and there a fragment of His Humanity. The perfect Divinity is seen only through the perfect Humanity. He is one Christ, not two Christs. The more fearlessly we explore the depths of His example as the likeness of man, the more complete will be our knowledge of His revelation of the Mind of God. It is one of the best of the dying speeches of a well-known French pastor,—'The more Jesus Christ is God, the more He is man; and the more He is man, the more He is God.' Paradoxical as this is in form, it is true in spirit. There is nothing in the Gospel history more divine than the Agony of Gethsemane or the Crucifixion on Calvary. In those depths of humiliation we can catch a likeness of the Divine glory which we miss even on the Mount of Transfiguration or the Ascension from Olivet. In this sense the Incarnation is the last and crowning sanction of the first truth of the Bible, 'In the image of God made He man.' It is the most complete declaration to the human race that in the mind and heart of man is the nearest approach that can be made to the Nature of God."

It was due to the Canon of Christ Church to quote these conforming phrases of doubtful meaning, lest we should give undue preponderance to the clear line of active thought which has meaning and truth in it except when thus interrupted and overlaid by conventional orthodoxy. If Adam was an Incarnation of God, we may hence understand Dr. Stanley's whole doctrine of Christ as the crowning Incarnation. But then we do not understand that the two natures, God and Man, are indivisible or identical, because analogous in the best that man has. We understand how Gethsemane and Calvary are at once human in mortal weakness and divine in spiritual strength; but we do not take the mortal weakness to be the spiritual strength. Nor could we, believing as we firmly do this kind of incarnation (which, however, we prefer calling the inspiration) of Christ, invoke either Him or the Father, "by the mystery of thy birth, temptation, bloody sweat and death and burial."

We resume our pleasanter and prevailing office of assenting and admiring analysis.

This thought "of the intire unity of God and Christ," extends light and consolation in many directions. "The works of Christ are the revelation of God;" they are "not His own works, but the works of His Father." Even the more special attributes of God appear in the character of Christ: his Grace, that is, love, sympathy, forgiveness, mercy; and his Truth, that is, truthfulness, sincerity, reality, justice. In the work of redemption, Christ and the Father are one. We may not confound the Persons, but neither may we divide the Substance. Milton, "our great Arian poet, in that striking but fantastic passage," may have represented the Father and the Son as in sharp conflict;



“but such is not the doctrine of the Bible or of the Church. *In the Sacrifice of Christ we see, if one may so say, the Sacrifice of God Himself.* In the Love of Christ we see the Love of God; the Truth of God is shewn us in the Truth of Christ. Christ forgives us because God forgives us; God forgives us because Christ forgives us. God, not apart from Christ, or against Christ, but God *in Christ*, has forgiven us.” Again: “The character of Christ is the explanation of His words and acts.” “Take away what we know of the character and life of Christ, and His crucifixion would become a mere exhibition of pain and suffering.” “It is from the long sacrifice of Nazareth and Capernaum that the one supreme sacrifice on Calvary receives its living savour.” So his Resurrection—a tale of mere wonder or miracle by itself—has its meaning as the natural close of the Life and Death which preceded it.

The preacher concludes with applying the Revelation of Christ to *these last days* “in which *we* stand in this generation.” If any voice is to make itself heard above our distractions it must be the voice of God in His Son. This is the one part of our religion that gains strength. Negative theology does not touch it. Strauss himself attests its genuineness and power in one place, if he resolves it into a myth elsewhere. We have not arrived at the end of it by far. Other ages dwelt exclusively on Bethlehem and Calvary. It has been reserved for this age to dwell on “the Mount of Olives and the Sea of Galilee; the scenes, not of a few hours or a few moments of our Blessed Lord’s appearance, but of those long days and years [almost too large a phrase perhaps] which represent to us the whole Life, the whole manifestation of the Word made flesh and dwelling amongst us. Let us accept the omen. God speaks by His Son *to us*. Let us obey Him; let us be like Him; let us *follow* Him though at a distance.”

Such is, in condensed abstract, the thought presented in these remarkable discourses. Remarkable they are as coming from a clergyman. They form part of the many-coloured, not to say motley, dress in which the Churchmanship of our day presents itself. While High Church sustains the ceremonies and exalts the hierarchy as usual, and Low Church sticks to the Creeds and Articles in the name of the law; while Essayists and Reviewers are brought to trial and condemned in the Court of Arches, the Judge apparently loth to condemn, and by his sentence sparing them even the appearance of recantation; when the Primacy is newly occupied by one who, as a simple clergyman, long ago made Tillotson’s wish respecting the Athanasian Creed his own; when a book of religious meditations is translated from the German by Royal Command, which not only shews negatively that the religion of the heart does not include what are called orthodox doctrines, but positively repudiates as obstructions to

heart-faith those of native depravity, an evil spirit, death-bed repentance and such like;—are we wrong in ascribing some considerable significance to these discourses of Dr. Stanley's, and anticipating no little influence from them? We are only somewhat impatient in observing how much freedom of theological thought men can assert for themselves under the hard fetters of subscription, instead of insisting that the fetters themselves should be removed. But if the clergy can continue thus to endure restraints that are unworthy alike of religion to impose or of manhood to bear, we must hope the laity will presently interpose to set free their spiritual guides, whether the latter will or no.

---

#### ADDITIONAL NOTES ON THE OLD TESTAMENT.

ALLOW me to acknowledge the courteous reply of S. S. to the strictures on his "Notes on the Old Testament," published by me in the Christian Reformer for December last. May I also take this opportunity of reminding him that I did not propose "tunic of extremities," as a *translation*, in Gen. xxxvii. 3, as he would seem to imply? I only mentioned the phrase as a step in the explanation. Nor can I assent to his statement that the meaning of the two passages in Jeremiah (xli. 16, l. 16), "must always remain doubtful." The authority of the Septuagint cannot be allowed to outweigh the reasons afforded by the passages themselves, as stated in my previous communication. This remark applies especially to the latter of the two, where "the oppressing sword" of *Median* invaders (not of Greeks) is unquestionably meant. If such be the meaning of the phrase in the one instance, we may reasonably conclude that it has the same import in the other.

As to "Shiloh," in Gen. xlix. 10, your correspondent will again observe that I would not "put up with" the authorized rendering as a *permanent* translation. I have no more doubt than S. S. that the authorized rendering is *wrong*. But "Shiloh" has the advantage of being the original word itself—the Hebrew word in English letters; and so it has a sort of neutral value (in spite of theological associations), and may very well stand until the interpreters come to a more general agreement, as they will doubtless do some day, as to the rendering to be substituted for it. If, however, S. S. should insist upon an immediate change, I would not retain "Shiloh" at all, even with his proposed addition of a preposition. I would render by "peace" or "rest." The verse would thus read, "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until peace come, and [until] the obedience of the peoples [is secured] to him." The writer's meaning is not a negative one, however; i. e. he does not say that even then the sceptre shall depart from Judah; but only

that he shall continue to be the leader of the nation for an indefinite extent of future time.

In the last "Notes" of S. S., there are two or three passages on which I shall be glad to make a few brief remarks; and with these I propose to take my leave of the subject, unless something in his future communications should appear to require particular notice.

Isaiah vi. 9, S. S. translates, "Say to this people, Hearing they hear, but ye do not understand; and seeing they see, but ye do not perceive. The heart of this people is made fat, their ears are made heavy, and their eyes are shut." He observes, "In the Authorized Version this is a command from God that the prophet is to make the hearts of the people fat, and their ears heavy, and this against the authority of the Septuagint and the New Testament." It might have been well to add that the rendering is according to the *Hebrew*, although against the Septuagint, followed by the New Testament. The whole verse (and the next verse also) is a command to the prophet, and may be regarded as equivalent to an indignant exclamation of Isaiah, at the sight of the insensibility of his people. Truly (he would say) it must be, it is, by the doing of Jehovah Himself, or by His command, that such blindness and dulness have fallen upon the nation. The *result*, in this instance, as in many others in the prophetic writings, is spoken of as the *intention*:—

"Go and tell this people,  
Hear ye indeed, but understand not;  
And see ye indeed, but perceive not:  
Make the heart of this people fat,  
And make their ears dull, and blind their eyes;  
Lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears,  
And understand with their heart, and return and be healed."

Isaiah xi. 13: "The envy of Ephraim shall depart, and the persecutions of Judah shall cease. Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not persecute Ephraim." The Authorized and Revised Versions have "adversaries of Ephraim." So the Hebrew, literally; the meaning being, adversaries *in* Judah, or *belonging to* Judah. The alteration proposed by S. S. is not a good one. The prophet is probably referring to the attempts made by Judah against Ephraim, i. e. to recover its dominion over the ten tribes after their revolt; as the "North" is now seeking to recover its old dominion in the "South;" probably, shall we say, with a similar result? "Persecutions" is not a word with which to express the warfare undertaken in the one case, any more than in the other. Perhaps we might translate,

"The envy of Ephraim shall depart,  
And the hostility of Judah shall cease;  
Ephraim shall not envy Judah,  
And Judah shall not be hostile to Ephraim."



This would keep nearer to the Hebrew than "persecutions" and "persecute;" but I do not know that it would be considered any improvement on the Common Version. With the opportunity of explanation by notes, we might very well adhere to the latter; for something must occasionally be conceded to ease or euphony of expression.

Isaiah ix. 11: "Therefore Jehovah will set up against him [Judah] the persecutions of Rezin, king of Syria." So S. S., adding, "The Authorized has 'adversaries of Rezin,' making the same mistake as in the former passage." Here I venture to say the mistake is with S. S. The "adversaries of Rezin" are the *Assyrians*: "for the King of Assyria (as we read, 2 Kings xvi. 9) went up against Damascus, and took it, and carried the people of it captive to Kir, and *slew Rezin*." Thus Israel, for its pride, is threatened by Isaiah (ix. 12) not only with its old enemies, the Syrians and Philistines, but with a more terrible foe. Additional reasons might be given for this interpretation; but it is so obvious and reasonable in itself, as not to require further confirmation.

V.

---

#### NOTES ON THE OLD TESTAMENT.

##### THE SERVANT OF JEHOVAH (Isaiah lii. 13—liii. 12).

*Jehovah speaks* :

- 13 Behold, my servant shall act prudently,  
He shall be exalted and lifted up, and be very high,
- 14 For those who were amazed at thee were many.  
So far as his visage was more marred than any man's,  
And his form more than the sons of Adam;
- 15 So far shall he cause many nations to admire,  
Kings shall shut their mouths before him;  
For that which had not been told them they shall see,  
And that which they had not heard they shall understand.

*Isaiah speaks* (chap. liii.):

- 1 But which of us believed what we heard?  
And to whom was the arm of Jehovah revealed?
- 2 For he had grown up before him as a weak plant,  
And as a root out of parched ground.  
He had no form or comeliness, that we should look at him,  
And no appearance that we should delight in him.
- 3 He was despised and forsaken of men,  
A man of sorrows and acquainted with grief,  
And as one from whom men hide their faces.  
He was despised, and we esteemed him not.
- 4 Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows;  
And we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God and afflicted.
- 5 But he was wounded for our transgressions,  
Bruised for our iniquities;

- The chastisement of our peace was upon him,  
And with his stripes we were healed.
- 6 All we like sheep had gone astray,  
We had turned every one to his own way,  
And Jehovah hath laid upon him the iniquity of us all.
- 7 He was oppressed and he was afflicted,  
Yet he opened not his mouth.  
He was brought as a lamb to the slaughter;  
And as a sheep before her shearers is dumb,  
So he opened not his mouth.
- 8 By ill treatment and by judgment he was taken away;  
And who of his generation considereth?  
For he was cut off out of the land of the living.
- Jehovah speaks:*  
Through the transgression of my people, violence came upon them.
- 9 And the wicked gave him his grave,  
And they were happy in his death;  
Although he had done no violence,  
Neither was deceit in his mouth.
- 10 Thus it pleased Jehovah to bruise and to afflict him.  
Although his soul maketh an offering for sin,  
He shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days,  
And the pleasure of Jehovah shall prosper in his hand.
- 11 Free from the travail of his soul,  
He shall see and be satisfied.  
By his knowledge my righteous servant shall make many righteous,  
For he shall bear their iniquities.
- 12 Therefore will I give him a portion with the great,  
And he shall divide the spoil with the strong,  
Because he hath poured out his soul unto death,  
And was numbered with the transgressors.  
For he bare the sin of many,  
And made intercession for the transgressors.

This interesting passage seems to be best explained by considering it as three speeches. First, Jehovah speaks in praise of his servant. Then, Isaiah regrets that this prophet had not been listened to, and describes the ill treatment which he received. Lastly, Jehovah promises that he shall be rewarded. For the translation, I have been chiefly guided by that of Dr. Vance Smith, and that of Dr. Benisch, making some corrections of my own. Of these the most important is, "Which of us believed what we heard?" This literal rendering is well supported by the context; and when the words are quoted by the apostle Paul, the same rendering of the Greek is required by the context, in the Epistle to the Romans, x. 16.

In several parts of the New Testament this description of the servant of Jehovah is quoted or referred to, as applicable to Jesus; but that it was meant originally for Jeremiah seems possible from its describing him in the very words in which Jeremiah describes himself. Jeremiah says that he was like a lamb,

or ox, that is brought to the slaughter, ch. xi. 19. The allusions, however, to a variety of circumstances which do not seem to belong to Jeremiah, or indeed to any known prophet, will perhaps always leave the meaning of the writer in doubt.

S. S.

#### AN AMICABLE CORRESPONDENCE.\*

AMICABLE theological correspondence has been very rare, especially when Unitarianism has been the subject of it; for though the advocates of Unitarian opinions have generally fought the battle of truth and liberty in a spirit not inconsistent with their position and profession as Christians in pursuit of "the truth as it is in Jesus," they have usually been exposed to much obloquy and reproach, much and varied injury. We therefore accept the present contribution to the religious discussions of the time with singular satisfaction. A serious attempt on the part of three clergymen to determine the exact testimony borne by the sacred writings to some of the essential principles of revealed truth cannot but excite a lively interest, especially at a time when so large a proportion of theological discussion tends to destroy the historic character of the Scriptures, and to base our religion on a mere human philosophy and not on revelation.

The doubts which have been expressed in some quarters of the genuineness of this Correspondence are quite groundless. The letters are the genuine production of three clergymen, and contain a bonâ-fide discussion of some of the chief points of doctrine which distinguish the Unitarian from the Trinitarian and Calvinistic churches. However feeble or ridiculous the advocates or the advocacy of "orthodox" doctrines may be, they are at least not fictitious; nor indeed are they much inferior to any of their predecessors, except in the arts of the advocate and the multiplicity and variety of words in which their arguments are expressed. E. F. has embraced Unitarian sentiments, and having resolved to send his sons to a school kept by a Unitarian, he is called to account by his two relatives A. B. and C. D. They were baptized in the Church, and their education by a Unitarian seems as inconsistent with truth and righteousness even as the "Improved Version."

The former of the two "orthodox" clergymen, A. B., contributes the larger portion of the Correspondence on his side of the question, and writes from the point of view occupied by the

\* Amicable Correspondence relative to some Popular Tenets as held by the United Church of England and Ireland; between A. B. and C. D., Beneficed Clergymen, and E. F., a Clergyman without Cure of Souls. Edited by E. F. Pp. 200. London—Whitfield. 1862.



common herd of Calvinistic controversialists of the last generation. The courtesies of friendly and polite correspondence are denied to the Unitarian, his chosen and appropriate designation is refused him, and he is pertinaciously called a "Socinian," in opposition to the claims equally of justice and civility. Unitarian criticisms are set aside as dishonest evasions. Mr. Martineau is quoted as saying,—

"I am constrained to say that neither my intellectual preference nor my moral admiration goes heartily with the Unitarian heros, sects, or productions of any age. Ebionites, Arians, Socinians—all seem to me to contrast unfavourably with their opponents, and to exhibit a type of thought and character far less worthy, on the whole, of the true genius of Christianity.

"I am *conscious* that my deepest obligations, as a learner from others, are in almost every department to writers *not of my own creed!* In Philosophy, I have had to unlearn most that I had imbibed from my early text-books, and the authors in chief favour with them. In Biblical interpretation, I derive from Calvin and Whitby the help that *fails me* in Crell and *Belsham!* In devotional literature and religious thought, I find nothing in *ours* that does not *pale* before Augustine, Tauler, and Pascal. And in the poetry of the Church, it is the Latin or German hymns, or the lines of Charles Wesley or of Keble, that fasten on my memory and heart, and make all else feel *poor and cold!*"—Pp. 8, 9.

And the ready conclusion follows that Unitarianism is not Christianity. This unhappy passage, which gave as much concern to Mr. Martineau's warmest admirers as it afforded pleasure to the enemies of our liberal theology, has become, as at the time of its publication we foretold it would, one of the stock pieces of orthodox writers desirous of depreciating Unitarianism. We shall doubtless meet it again and again whenever the controversy re-appears. The answer which E. F. gives to A. B. deserves a place in our pages.

"Unitarians are agreed on the grand point of not giving God's glory to another; therefore they worship the one God and Father of all through the one mediator, the man Christ Jesus, as he enjoined and practised himself. On all minor points they advocate complete freedom of opinion; and this system tends more effectually to harmony and union amongst them than the old plan of compelling assent to a multitude of articles—articles of human composition.

"Mr. Martineau is an able and eloquent man, and, through his talents and estimable qualities, is justly influential in the Unitarian body. But he is also known to be mystically disposed; something, perhaps, after the fashion of Quesnel and the Jansenists. He favours the principle of the gradual development of the human race in spiritual knowledge and graces; he therefore lays more value on the internal and spiritual power and suitableness of the Christian revelation, than on any external evidences of their Divine origin. Hence his admiration of the writings of many *not of his creed*, the Augustines, Pascals, Wesleys, Kebles, and his superfluous aspirations to be included in the same goodly fellowship and ranks of the Christian army, with those noble spirits."—P. 11.

Some rash words of Mr. Belsham occupy a prominent place in this one-sided statement, as indicative of Unitarian disregard for the authority of the Scriptures, while no notice is taken of the Unitarian Lardner, whose learned industry did more for establishing the genuineness of the Scriptures than any dignitary of whom the Establishment could boast. But perhaps A. B. may not have heard of him. The results of modern criticism are set aside without any hesitation, and every text whose English expression in the Authorized Version of the Scriptures seems to be favourable to the Trinitarian hypothesis is unreservedly quoted in support of it, however doubtful be its meaning or questionable its genuineness. Even 1 John v. 7 is defended as a portion of the genuine word of God.

The idea of revising or improving the Common Version is repudiated even with indignation.

"I can only state my conviction," says A. B., "that a better version of the Holy Scriptures will never be produced,—one more faithful, more true to the original, more honest in design, or more free from forgeries and mistranslations, than is the Authorized Version."

Hence he insists on the admission, as a necessary preliminary to any theological discussion that can be either consistent or useful, that "the Authorized Version of the Scriptures is the inspired word of God." Receiving his inspiration from the Nares', Horsleys and Magees of a former generation, A. B. is filled with an extravagant and superstitious dread and abhorrence of the "Improved Version," quite unaware, as it would appear, that it was, for the most part, the work of an Archbishop, while he entitles it "one of the most fearful, dishonest and ungodly publications that ever came forth from the press;" and probably equally unaware that such men as Lowth and Blayney, as well as Newcome, esteemed it a duty which they owed to the God of truth to contribute what they could to an *Improved Version* of the Scriptures. C. D. is a controversialist of the same stamp, equally beyond the reach of modern criticism, and to whom it would appear that the Griesbachs and Tischendorfs and Lachmans are only mythic personages, with whom the orthodox student of the Scriptures has no concern and ought to have nothing to do. Somewhat more imaginative, however, than A. B., he seeks to convince his Unitarian opponent of the untenable character of his heresy by some arguments not drawn from the Scriptures, and which we hardly expected to meet again in this controversy. Of these, the following, quoted from p. 84 of the Correspondence, is the most remarkable:

"A word or two as to the *argumentum ad absurdum* broached by me in my former note, arguing from the reason of things in favour of a plurality of Divine persons from all eternity. I did not mean it as an *independent* theory 'above what is written,' but merely to show that human reason and human feeling, far from rejecting or disrelishing the highest

Trinitarian views on this subject, are really in favour of them, nay, even seem to require such a supposition, seeing that we otherwise condemn God to a state of *solitude* for a past eternity; a Being who said, 'It is not good for man to be alone,' to be himself alone and lonesome; a God whose name is 'Love,' to be without an object to love, or to be loved by;—a perfectly happy Being without a partner in his affections and happiness;—a mere hermit, another Robinson Crusoe, or rather Alexander Selkirk, in whose mouth a Christian poet has justly put the well-known words,—

‘O Solitude, where are the charms  
That sages have found in thy face?  
Better dwell in the midst of alarms  
Than reign in this horrible place.’

In fact, I cannot imagine such a solitary Godhead, and consider it only a step removed from absolute Atheism.”

Very different from both of these writers in every respect is E. F. Having studied the subject which he discusses with diligence and success, his letters are at once scholarly and instructive in a very high degree. He did not at all stand in need of D. L.’s learned and experienced pen to dispose satisfactorily of every argument adduced in opposition to his simple and scriptural faith. While he discusses the various subjects which the controversy embraces with the most perfect freedom, all his letters are pervaded by the caution, modesty and reverence which the loftiness and sacredness of their main subject demands. Frequently tried by the intolerance, presumption or uncharitableness of his opponents, he never forgets the courtesy and gentleness of the Christian gentleman. On his part especially the correspondence is pre-eminently “amicable.”

The letters of E. F. contain much valuable criticism on many portions of scripture which present difficulties to the young theologian who is in pursuit of a faith which may contain nothing to shock either his reason or his conscience; and were it not that the price of the book removes it beyond the reach of many readers, we should congratulate the Unitarian public on the addition of so pleasing and useful a contribution to our popular and theological literature. And though A. B. and C. D. appear to so very little advantage in this discussion, that some orthodox critics have imagined their letters to be fictitious, invented as a mere burlesque of orthodoxy, and specially intended and adapted for easy refutation, they are not only quite genuine, but contain a large proportion of all that can really be advanced in favour of the system which they advocate. The remainder of the argument, as it has been generally conducted, has consisted mainly of the artifices of oratorical advocacy, and the variety of accusations unnecessarily and unjustly advanced against the heretic as well as his heresy.

This Correspondence is succeeded by a long Appendix, in which E. F. reviews the controversy generally, points out some



of the difficulties and discouragements which must be encountered by the advocate of unpopular truth, and the general principles by which he has been guided at once in the adoption and the defence of his Unitarian opinions, and adds not a little argument and criticism confirmatory of his previous letters. He expresses the opinion, about the accuracy of which the thoughtful observer of the signs of the times can hardly entertain any doubt, that "the principles for which the Unitarians contend, are spreading gradually but effectually among the learned and thoughtful." The "Essays and Reviews" point very decidedly to an undercurrent of bold and free inquiry in the Established Church, however scornfully some of her ministers may doubt or question it; while the cry of heresy arises so often in other "orthodox" quarters as to leave no reasonable doubt that the *right and duty*, and with these the *natural consequences*, of *free inquiry* are making themselves felt even within the most sacred theological enclosures, in defiance of every obstacle which the Established or the Dissenting priest may throw in its way. Nor is the hope unreasonable that this Amicable Correspondence will contribute something to the advancement of religious truth and liberty.

We conclude our notice of this valuable work by an extract which will suitably illustrate both the spirit in which the advocate of our faith has entered on his task, and the intellectual power with which he has defended simple Christian truth.

"My dearest C—,—I accept the glove which you have thrown down, and trust to be enabled to perform my part in the gentle combat in the same frank and friendly spirit, and with equally sincere purpose of maintaining the honour of Jehovah and 'the truth as it is in Jesus.'

"In proceeding to execute this task to the best of my ability, I do not expect to convince you of the soundness of my views or interpretations of Scriptural statements. There will probably ever exist varieties of opinion even amongst members of the same denomination regarding passages of the Bible (as of any book in human language), not excepting such as by many may be deemed vital. But with me, as I think you will have observed, it is a primary rule in theological investigations to endeavour to make the Bible its own expositor and illustrator, and more especially in cases of doubtful or contested expressions, to seek to elucidate them by reference to corresponding phrases which are clear and not open to dispute. The same respect for the Word of God impels me to inquire respecting any dogma propounded by human authority for belief, 'Is it written?' and to exercise my liberty in receiving or rejecting it if it be not expressly declared therein. 'Tis thus I act in reference to the astounding doctrine of a Trinity in Unity, with all its metaphysical and perplexing details (see the Athanasian Creed throughout). I decline to accept *such* an article of faith *principally* because 'it is not' (to repeat the words of the judicious Hooker) 'to be found in Scripture by express literal mention.' Bishop Beveridge also (quoted in 'Tracts for the Times,' vol. iii. p. 30, No. 77) says, 'There are many things which, although they are not read expressly and definitely in Scripture, yet by the common consent of all Christians are attained from it. For instance,

that in the everlasting Trinity three distinct persons are to be worshipped, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and that each of these is very God, and yet that there is only one God; that Christ is *θεανθρωπος*, very God and very man in one and the same person.' Again, South says ('Considerations on the Trinity,' p. 38), 'It must be allowed that there is no such proposition as this, *that one and the same God is three different persons*, to be found in the sacred writings of the Old or New Testament; neither is it pretended that there is any word of the same signification or import with the term *Trinity* used in Scripture in relation to God.' I might cite many other orthodox divines to a similar purport, including those demigods Luther and Calvin, who reprobate the terms 'Trinity,' 'Homousian,' 'Person,' 'Essence,' 'O holy and glorious Trinity,' as *unscriptural, frigid, vulgar, and savouring of barbarism*. But I conceive the main facts, without any such testimony, to be sufficiently self-evident.

"Your ingenious *argumentum ad absurdum* likewise, with regard to the *supposed cheerless condition* of a God existing *alone* from all eternity, is devoid of any countenance from the letter or spirit of Scripture. It relates also to a subject too remote from human comprehension to be ascertained by reason. God is not such as we are; His resources are infinite and inexhaustible. Eternity, too, is outside the sphere of human conception. In reference to it there may be no past or future—no yesterday or to-morrow; it may be one unchanging *now*. What then can we safely imagine touching the mode of God's existence, or the nature of his *contemplations*? 'How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of Jehovah, or hath been his *counsellor*? With whom took he counsel, and who instructed him, and taught him in the path of judgment, and showed him the way of understanding? Hast thou not known, hast thou not heard, that the everlasting God, Jehovah, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary? there is no searching of his understanding' (Rom. ii. 33, 34, and Isaiah xl. 14, 28). I cannot imagine or suppose such a being ever to have been inactive or inoperative. But this appears pretty plain, that if you set up two or three supreme, infinite minds or spirits,—call them what you please, or decline to style them *Gods* if you will,—they are substantially the same, and are *so many* distinct objects of *supreme* homage, trust, veneration; so that the *oneness* of Jehovah is virtually subverted. Such is not the lesson inculcated in these words of Scripture:—'Hear, O Israel, Jehovah our God is one Jehovah' (Deut. vi. 4); 'God is *a* Spirit' (John iv. 24); 'For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of a man that is in him?' (*i.e.* the man himself) 'even so the things of God knoweth no one, but the Spirit of God' (*i.e.* God himself), 1 Cor. ii. 11.

"(In my former letter I asked, on the hypothesis of three omniscient Beings abiding together from eternity, what could each communicate to the others that would not be already and alike known to all? They would in fact be mere counterparts and repetitions of each other. Can these be the *one God* of the Bible?)"—Pp. 85—87.

## HEINRICH ZSCHOKKE.\*

IF heretofore Heinrich Zschokke received from the reading public of England less attention than his merits fairly entitled him to receive, the omission is now about to be atoned for. An author whose works were the favourite study of the late Prince Albert, and some of whose more serious and devout meditations are known to have comforted and soothed our Queen in her deep sorrow, is sure of exciting the attention and interest of Englishmen. Zschokke was certainly no common man. His pursuits and publications were singularly various. He appeared before his contemporaries as "poet, historian, novelist, dramatist, politician, diplomatist, newspaper editor, popular instructor, reformer and philosopher." Varied as were his contributions to literature, and important as were his services to his countrymen, he was but little known in this country prior to the year 1845, when his Autobiography was offered in an English dress in one of the volumes of the Foreign Library published by Messrs. Chapman and Hall. The translator spoke not untruly when he thus described the claims of Heinrich Zschokke on the esteem and admiration of mankind:

"The life of the Man is striking and interesting enough to stand by itself, unrecommended by the merit or celebrity of the Statesman and the Author. To some, the narrative of the mental struggles, wanderings, and meditations of one who, rejecting the support of tradition and authority, and relying solely on self-help and God's help, which ever accompanies true self-help, has fought his way stoutly through the wilderness of doubt and unbelief into the clear and golden sunshine of a genuine and healthful Christianity, will of itself have more of worth and attraction than the most brilliant chain of startling events and achievements would have. But even to those who feel little or no interest in such a history, the stirring events in which it was Zschokke's lot to be engaged—the conspicuous part which he played in Switzerland, when that country was the scene of military, political, and social struggles of more than one European interest—the narrative of his efforts and successes as statesman and reformer, as the teacher, the protector, and the guide of his people—the eventful course of good and evil fortune which led the narrator, now into exile, poverty, outlawry; now into courts and cabinets, and *proconsular* dignities—will, it is believed, supply many unfailing sources of interest and instruction. For in Zschokke's life, as in his character, greatness in thought and greatness in action are united in harmonious and healthy proportion—a sight in these modern times as rare as it is at all times beneficial and delightful." Pp. iv, v.

Without attempting anything like a sketch of the life of this

---

\* The Hand-Book of Family Devotion, translated from the German of Heinrich Zschokke, Author of the "Meditations on Death and Eternity," lately published under the Sanction of the Queen. 8vo. Pp. 368. London—Simpkin, Marshall and Co.



remarkable man, we put together a few facts connected with it. He was born, March 22, 1771, in the town of Magdeburg, where his father, a simple, honest burgher, conducted a prosperous business as a clothmaker. His mother died a few weeks after Heinrich's birth. The gifted, imaginative boy lived in a world of dreams of which his father knew nothing. He has drawn an amusing picture of the weariness of spirit with which he endured his early education.

"School and church were alike mere scenes of weariness and vexation to the thoughtless urchin, and their only real use was that of early accustoming him to the exercise of patience. Morning, noon, and night, I was obliged to repeat certain formulas of prayer, of which I understood not a word. I was often told of God and his angels. The idea of the bright-winged angels pleased me particularly, and I often wished that I were one of them, or even one of the little birds that I saw flying about so merrily. My thoughts were, however, still oftener busied with fancies concerning the dreadful rough-haired devil with his horns, his tail, and his cloven hoof. This noted theological hero appeared to me as a personage of far greater consequence than God himself; wherein I certainly scarcely differed from many of the pious Christian multitude, even in this nineteenth century. How many are still like the Natchez Indians, who, in their primeval forests, seldom pray to the Good Spirit, because according to his nature he can do nothing but good, but who often sacrifice to the Evil Spirit their best piece of game, or the dainty hump that grows upon the shoulders of the bison, in order to secure themselves from danger."—P. 4.

He lost his father when eight years of age, and his education was then conducted with the son of his elder brother, almost of his own age. Placed at the school of a convent, he for a time deluded by his sharpness and inventive wit his teachers as to his progress, but in the end was expelled by these wiseacres on the ground of utter mental incapacity. His eldest sister took charge of him and placed him in another school. He soon began to improve in his intellectual habits, though he was still a wild and odd boy. In his seventeenth year, resenting an unsuccessful attempt to proceed to the University, he ran away and joined himself to a band of theatrical adventurers, taking upon himself the office of the company's poet and correspondent. After two years of this wild and dangerous life, he put himself once more into communication with his friends, and proceeded to the University of Frankfort. As changeable and full of contrasts as the figures of the kaleidoscope were the phases of his life and character. Now he became a student, insatiable in his love of knowledge, devoting himself to philosophy, law and theology. Selected from the rest of the students to pronounce a funeral eulogy on a lifeless companion, he won admiration and tears from his audience. But now his mind was harassed by conscious oscillations between a love of mysticism and a stubborn incredulity. At the age of twenty-two he gained his degree as Doctor in Philosophy,

and visited his relations at Magdeburg, receiving the small remains of his paternal inheritance. The next three years were passed at Frankfort as a private academic teacher, and his lectures acquired for him a considerable amount of academic popularity. Wearied with the doubts he could not overcome, he fled from metaphysical to studies of a most varied kind, including science, history and diplomacy. Next he became a traveller: passing through the principal cities of Germany, he proceeded to Switzerland, spending a winter in Zurich and Berne; thence he passed on to France, eager to study the people of that country under the new influences to which the Revolution had given birth. His heart sickened at the unrealities and the crimes he witnessed in the licentious capital of France. He proposed to fly to Rome, but stopped on his road at Berne. Wherever he went he attracted attention and won friendship. At Berne he was invited to undertake an important part in a great educational establishment, the Seminary of Reichenau. His success was wonderful. Before a year was over, seventy pupils sat around him. In addition to the labours of a teacher, he became an author, composing, in the spirit of a reformer and a lover of republican institutions, a History of Rhaetia, which won for him extensive fame. The revolutionary storm then driving across Europe broke on the country of his adoption. He became an object of suspicion, and escaped by a timely, but in the first instance accidental, flight the destruction designed for him. After various employments and changes of fortune in exile, he, on the breaking out of the war between Austria and France, was recalled to Switzerland and to his rights as a naturalized citizen, and received an appointment as Government commissary for Unterwalden. He strove with energy most admirable, and a patriotism seldom surpassed in purity and earnestness, to save and benefit the country desolated by war and faction. He tried to unite the different parties in Switzerland, whose factious strifes prevented their country from becoming the surest fortress of freedom and a firm partition-wall between the great powers of Europe. We cannot follow him through the chequered experiences of his public and private life. He married, and his domestic life was eminently peaceful and happy. In 1804, he commenced his career at Aarau as a public instructor through the press. For thirty years he continued the publication of his "Swiss Messenger." It acquired a wonderful popularity and was circulated wherever the German tongue was understood. How lofty and pure his aspirations as a teacher of the people were, let these his words shew:

"I seemed to have found my true vocation. I would gladly leave to the king his sceptre, to the general his sword, to the merchant his ships, to the artist his pencil and chisel, and his laurels into the bargain. I would seek with the pen and the printing-press, a wider sphere of action than was ever bestowed by any office, and means more powerful

than any other for forwarding the good cause of human improvement. I know, indeed, no purer ambition than that of associating ourselves for such a purpose as this with the noblest of our race, the true heroes of humanity, the legitimate princes of the spiritual world, who operate on it as surely as the laws of nature on the world of sense."—P. 147.

As he approached his fortieth year, the deep religious sensibilities of his noble nature, which no sceptical doubts had been able to subdue, awoke to conscious strength. He looked with indifference on the parties and factions in religion, but with a yearning love to the pure religion of Jesus Christ.

"Melancholy and discontent became, however, sometimes involuntarily my feelings, when I beheld the simplicity and clearness which mark the divine revelations of Jesus, obscured and almost stifled under a dead load of formulas, or else so darkened by the wordy rubbish of pedantic and quarrelsome theologians, that a ponderous system of human folly, such as the world's Redeemer never taught, or knew, or permitted, assumed the place of all which is highest and holiest in human wisdom. The word of salvation was to have united the nations into one vast family of God; but theological fanaticism had split them into hostile sects and churches, who turned the religion of love into the religion of hatred. The masses in the Christian community who were unpractised or unsuccessful in free investigation, were compelled to satisfy the moral hunger of the devout soul with mere hollow formulas and ceremonies; and endeavoured in their simplicity to smooth the road for the spirit's entrance into the world of spirits, by church ceremonies, forms, and ordinances."—P. 152.

Pondering, in the year 1807, on the state of the world in respect to religion, he resolved to do what in him lay to awaken to life the religious vitality of the public mind, and from the husk of a formal religion to develop a pure and lofty Christianity. He commenced anonymously a weekly Sunday paper, issued at the lowest remunerative price. It was entitled, "*Hours of Devotion for the Advancement of True Christianity and Domestic Piety.*" For eight years he continued, and with growing success, his noble task. The separate parts were ultimately published, and in various ways, in a collected form.

"As soon as the work had been spread through various Christian churches and countries by means of new editions, reprints, selections, imitations, and translations, other voices began to raise themselves concerning it. Among the Protestants many found it not sufficiently orthodox; there was too much common sense in it. The pious theologian, Dr. Tholuck of Berlin, thought himself obliged, so late as 1840, to publish his own improved '*Hours of Devotion*' for those Christians 'who would not be contented with a rationalistic view of the Gospel.' Among the Catholics it was frequently condemned from the pulpit. Here and there it was prohibited, and anathematised as the work of Satan."—P. 154.

What the influence was which induced Heinrich Zschokke to avow the authorship of these holy Hours, to which he had devoted the mornings of six long winters, is best told in his own words:



"I beheld in silence the various adventures of the seed I had cast forth. Priestly vituperations, however, devoid alike of reason and charity, only heightened the joyful consciousness of not having deserved them.

"So long as intolerant religious zeal directed its attacks either by name or by significant hints and innuendoes, against myself, I cared nothing about the matter. But when the enemies of my book, misled by fancied marks and coincidences, directed their furious hostility against other innocent men—men far more conspicuous and important than myself—then I was often tempted from a sense of justice to step forward and raise the veil of anonymous authorship."—Pp. 154, 155.

What other incidents there were in the life of this good man we cannot now stop to tell. Just before the curtain fell, he spoke these words of epilogue :

"I regret not that I have lived. Others may in the autumn of their days, look over and count their harvests; I cannot. I scattered the seed; where the wind carried it, I know not. The will for good was mine; its prospering was in the hands of God. Some unproductive seed I have also sown, yet I accuse not myself nor Heaven. Others may rejoice in their, more or less, hardly-won riches, or honours, or renown. I envy not their joy and pity their labour. Fortune's favour had no golden treasure for me; but content with that which diligence has won, and frugality has kept, I enjoy the noble independence for which I have always striven, and out of which I have been able to succour others yet poorer. Rank? I desired only that of a better humanity! Once only, in my youth, I sought a post of honour; but never again in my whole course of life; I have declined as many as I have accepted; and these I accepted only when the better qualified were wanting. Renown? An author's celebrity? Mere soap bubbles! I had a loftier aim than these."—P. 218.

This sketch of some of the incidents in the life of Zschokke will disclose to us the influences which made his memory dear to Prince Albert, one whose spirit was attuned to the same lofty aims, and who loved to benefit by his self-denying wisdom the country of his adoption.

We thank Dr. Beard very cordially for the preparation and publication of his *Hand-book*. It forms a suitable companion to the volume translated by the order of the Queen, and to which, under the title of "*Death and Eternity*," the English public has given a very favourable reception. The work now before us, as the editor well observes, "*presents Faith, Duty and Hope in their Christian aspects, bearings and issues, especially as seen in the family circle.*" The first seven chapters treat of the attributes of God; then follow six chapters relating to Christ; and then we are presented with more than thirty chapters illustrating Christian morality, first in its connection with Christian doctrine, and then as evolved by the human soul and applied to the various relations of social and domestic life.

The essays are characterized throughout by a combination of

sterling sense with true devotional feeling. The doctrine taught is pervaded by the principle, in relation to mankind, of the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Jesus Christ. There is no asceticism in the morality taught; on the contrary, it is throughout as cheerful as it is practical. We anticipate from the wide diffusion of these liberal and earnest religious essays a large amount of good. They will rebuke many prevalent superstitions, and inspire the thoughtful mind, conscious of having departed from the tracks of orthodox belief, with confidence in the correctness of its conclusions. These words occur towards the close of the admirable essay on "the Evil of Figurative Representations of God."

"Let us be careful not to ascribe to God, in thought, affection, word, or deed, our own human infirmities. Only that which is good is in God. God is the All-perfect good. And would you know what the description means, call to mind the declarations of Christ, how that God is Spirit, and that he himself is the image of God. The Father is seen in the Son. God's Spirit, then, is one with the Spirit of Christ. The spirit of the one is in kind the spirit of the other. If, then, you would know God, study Christ. What Christ was God is. Every word Christ spoke, every deed he performed, is a reflection not only of his spirit, but the spirit of his Father. They are both rays of the one celestial and inextinguishable light. They are aspects of the same imperishable diamond of divine brilliancy and preciousness.

"Hence Christ's life is your touchstone. To that touchstone you, as a disciple of Christ, are to bring not only all human doctrines, but all Scriptural terms and representations. Only as interpreted by the thought of Christ is this word or that conception true, divinely and everlastingly true."—P. 18.

As a specimen of the morality of these essays, we may select a passage from the second on "a Good Old Age." After exposing the suicidal folly of those who like to appear more unhappy than they really are, who make complaints in order that they may be objects of others' pity, there follows this admirable counsel:

"Dost thou indeed like to appear otherwise than thou art: then seem more contented and happy. Skilfully transform thy disposition into a happy one; look on the bright side of unpleasantness; animate thyself with lively thoughts upon everything, and if anything move thee too much, quickly divert thy mind with judicious change. Invest thyself with the light-heartedness of childhood, which offers to every calamity only a fleeting tear, and quickly surrenders itself again to pleasure. In a few years that contentment and calmness which were at first affected, when formed into a habit, ultimately become natural to thee. And that is the victory of the spirit over the sorrowful dominion of thy earthly nature; that is the way to secure a long and happy life! It lies solely in man's own power, how much or how little vexation and grief he shall suffer, how great or how little share in occasional evils. He who suffers least, is he not the happiest? If thou hast early accus-

tomed thyself to meet evil with undisturbed serenity, then wilt thou one day think lightly of the discomforts of old age."—P. 329.

Of the merits of the work as a translation we have not qualified ourselves to speak, but we have found the English version here presented us generally smooth, intelligible and pleasant. Passages obscure or inelegant are the very rare exceptions. The poetical selections are always appropriate and often beautiful. Why is not the reader helped to a clue to the poets' names, and a reference to the particular work from which each quotation is made? As far as the reader is concerned, it is tantalizing not to know the name of an author who has pleased him. And in reference to the poet, simple justice surely requires that when you borrow your gems, you should not conceal the name of the skilful hand that has set them so well. Prayers are by their very nature above the critic. We should have better liked the direct devotional part of this Hand-book had it been less didactic and more emotional. We want for the purposes of family devotion not an echo, however just and true, to an essay or a sermon, but a genuine outpouring of the heart,—at work upon itself, conscious of its own weaknesses and wants, and aspiring to communion with the Unseen and the Eternal.

---

#### VALIDITY OF NONCONFORMIST BAPTISMS.

THE following correspondence (which explains itself) is of sufficient importance to warrant its publication in our pages. The case which has arisen at Swindon may occur elsewhere; and it will be a satisfaction to persons whose religious liberty is affected by the denial of funeral rites to the remains of their relatives, to know that such denial is a violation of law where the baptismal formula recognized in the New Testament and by the law of the land is complied with.

British and Foreign Unitarian Association Office, 178, Strand,  
January 14, 1863.

Dear Sir,—The Committee of this Association have received your letters, asking their advice and aid in relation to the validity of baptisms celebrated by you, and to the claim of those baptized by you to full burial rites in the parish church.

I was authorized by the Committee to submit the case to their solicitor, Mr. E. W. Field, and to ask him to give them a legal opinion on the point.

In writing to Mr. Field, I explained to him that the question was one of some importance to you, inasmuch as the public, as well as private, teachings of the Reverend incumbent of the new church at Swindon have produced a deep and wide-spread impression on the minds of his parishioners that persons not baptized by a clergyman of the Established Church must on their death, if interred in the churchyard, be



buried without the body being taken into the church, and without having the burial service read over them. I was able to assure him that your invariable custom in baptizing children was to pronounce the baptismal formula prescribed by the Saviour in Matthew xxviii. 19.

Mr. Field immediately gave the case the necessary consideration, and sent to the Committee the reply which follows.

It will, I hope, prove satisfactory to you and to those persons at Swindon who wish to have their children baptized by you. It will assure them that there is no necessity for their taking their children to church for baptism to save them at death from the insult which the incumbent is reported to threaten to his Nonconformist parishioners on decease.

You are at perfect liberty to make any use you think desirable of Mr. Field's letter and mine.

I have only, in conclusion, to request that should any case arise affecting your own religious liberty, as secured by the law of the land, or that of any of your hearers, you will immediately report the circumstances to us, that we may take the necessary steps for vindicating the law.

I am, dear Sir, yours faithfully,

R. BROOK ASPLAND,

Secretary of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association.

To the Rev. F. R. Young, Swindon.

36, Lincoln's Inn Fields, Dec. 12, 1862.

My dear Sir,—I cannot conceive there is any doubt that the incumbent of Swindon is bound to bury every person with Christian service who is not within the prohibition of the ecclesiastical law (i. e. not unbaptized, excommunicated, &c.): and that he may be proceeded against both at law and in the ecclesiastical courts if he refuse. See what Lord Denman says in *Queen v. Stewart*, 12 Adolphus and Ellis, in p. 778.

In a recent case in the Privy Council, on an appeal from the Court of Arches, it was held (confirming the decision of the Arches' Court) that a child baptized with water by a layman in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, had been baptized within the meaning of the Rubric; and a clergyman of the Church of England (the vicar of Gedney, Lincolnshire) having refused to perform the burial office after due notice of the death, was suspended from the ministry for three months. See *Rev. J. S. Escott and Mastin*, 4 Moore's Privy Council Cases, p. 104.

The judgment in this case goes most fully into the law on the subject, and is very long, occupying twenty pages of the volume.

The Judges present and concurring in this decision were Lords Wynford and Brougham, Mr. Justice Erskine and the Right Hon. Dr. Lushington.

The Privy Council is the ultimate court of appeal on this subject.

I am, my dear Sir, yours faithfully,

Rev. R. B. Aspland.

EDWIN W. FIELD.

## THE DISTRESS IN DUKINFIELD.

SIR,

WHILST the press and various public officers are insisting upon the fact that the worst is over here, that the tide has turned, that every week there is a large diminution of pauperism, that industrial relations are being restored between masters and men, and that in a few months the bulk of the population will cease to burden the charity funds of the country,—the truth probably is, that the amount of pauperism remains about the same, less in some places, more in others,—that since all hope of a speedy termination of the civil war in America has died away, some of the manufacturers who had entirely closed their mills are making trials with Surat cotton, being anxious to maintain the traditions of labour and to prevent the workpeople from turning their attention to emigration. To a stranger, the conflict of evidence on these points must be most perplexing; and whether the question be the increase or the decline of pauperism, the amount of industrial earnings, the health of the population or the amount of poor's rates, he will hear, from apparently the best sources, statements which no ingenuity can reconcile. As to the diminution of pauperism, no evidence can be received from the books of the Guardians, as they are everywhere transferring their obligations to Relief Committees, striking the destitute off their lists, and, at the expense of charity and duty, earning a glorious reputation amongst economical ratepayers. The Relief Committees have no alternative; they cannot let these poor people starve, and they save the rates at the expense of public charity. Again, some mill-owners are closing their establishments, unable to pay wages off East-Indian cotton; others, in larger numbers probably, are trying what they can make of this dirty, over-pressed fibre. This is the true explanation of Mr. Farnall's returns.

As to the rate of wages,—extremely various, ranging for piece work from nothing to twelve shillings or even more per week. The nothing admits of this explanation: a spinner has to employ a piccer, and it has happened not unfrequently that the remuneration has been sufficient only to satisfy the demands of the latter. Earning papers are constantly brought to the Board of Guardians, duly signed by managers, and indicating that an adult operative may work from Monday morning till Friday evening at half-past five, for the sum of ninepence, or it may be one and fivepence, or, in the case of an expert weaver, double this amount. And yet there has been no professed reduction in wages; the owners of the mills are wealthy, and so far from taking advantage of the scarcity of work, they in many instances supplement the wages by large weekly donations of money and food.

The rating question has elicited perhaps the greatest discrepancy, the figures ranging from 4 to 100 per cent. on annual value. In Dukinfield, the simple fact is, that within a month we have paid six shillings in the pound, being the second and third rates for the year,—that we have paid for that period eight times as much money as we usually pay,—and that it is possible before the close of the financial year that we may be called upon again.

Last week the Manchester Committee issued with their imprimatur a report presented to them by Lord Derby, indicating the proper destination of the funds entrusted to them, limiting their application strictly

for the *sustenance* of distressed operatives; no subscriptions to sick or burial societies to be paid from them; no applicant to be recognized who possesses unmortgaged property or money in the savings' bank; *no rents to be paid.*

The limitation affecting sick and burial societies will be simply inoperative; neither central nor local Committees can prevent this appropriation. It will be made, and will, pro tanto, reduce the sustenance fund of the family. The rent question stands on a different basis. Some local Committees have tacitly sanctioned payment of rents; for the future they are bound to repudiate this application of money, and the result will probably be the ruin of the small owners of cottage property. They are naturally in a state of consternation—have held meetings, made wild proposals, and in some instances have threatened wholesale evictions. I have no fear of this being done on a large scale, and it must be allowed that their condition is deserving of sympathy. A man possessed, after long years of frugality and industry, of one or two cottages, with perhaps some liabilities still attaching to them, is in a worse position now than the mill-hand unencumbered with possessions of any kind. If, as some imagine, this cotton famine continues for a year or two, the ruin of this class is final and irretrievable. Appeals to Parliament, now in agitation, will of course be in vain; and it is to be hoped that private benevolence will step in and, in rescuing these deserving people, vindicate the rights of providence and frugality. The fund so kindly entrusted to Mr. Bass and myself will, I hope, go partly in this direction. Many an aged person, perhaps a widow, has a few pounds in the savings' bank as a funeral provision, justly considered a safer investment than a claim upon a burial club. All of this must be spent before the possessor can receive relief, and the last hope of honest poverty will be wrecked, the first great dread of industry realized, that of being buried in a parish coffin. Any attempt of the small proprietor to obtain food or clothing from public sources would probably end in a committal as a vagrant. For this class I am anxious still to beg clothing or money.

Amidst so much that is discouraging and depressing, it is pleasant to be able to say a word of encouragement, and to advise readers to disregard altogether the romance recently compiled by Dr. Buchanan, the Special Commissioner of the Privy Council. He writes in the sensation style, and states that "one of the most lamentable consequences of extreme destitution has made its appearance." Speaking of typhus fever, he says: "This steady follower on famine has again appeared, and in Preston and Manchester has assumed an epidemic form. *Rare cases of the summer have multiplied to scores in the autumn.*" Further on, he alludes to epidemic outbreaks of infantile diseases assuming a very low type; and characterizes the decent matrons who tend the children of mothers working in a factory as ignorant beldams.

Where Dr. Buchanan obtained his information as to epidemic typhus it is impossible to say. It is not correct; and to disprove it, scientific and reliable evidence is at hand. Union officers deny its acquaintance; the Manchester and Salford Sanitary Association, a scientific body with rare opportunities of recording health statistics, absolutely contradicts it. "During (say they) the months of Oct., Nov. and Dec., 1861, we find 187 deaths registered under the generic term of fever in Manchester and Salford, of which number 17 were distinctly marked off by the



Registrar as occasioned by typhus. In the course of the next three months (first quarter of 1862), out of 133 fatal cases of fever, typhus again claimed 21; and in the three that followed, the respective numbers were 89 and 10. We thus find that in the first six months of 1862, 31 deaths occurred in Manchester from genuine typhus fever. In the next quarter (and to this and the succeeding one the Report more especially refers as those in which the disease took on its epidemic character), the total mortality from fever is set down as only 78 cases, of which 11 are stated to have been due to typhus; and in that which followed (last of the year 1862) the numbers are 118 and 12. . Thus we see that during the six months the famine epidemic is said to have prevailed, it carried off only 23 victims; whilst during the six preceding months, it sacrificed no less than 31." In a city like Manchester, with half a million of inhabitants, the number of deaths from fever would rarely be below those given. Dr. Edward Smith, likewise a Commissioner deputed by the Privy Council, stated last month, at a meeting of the Manchester Statistical Society, that he had found no starvation fever in any of the towns near Manchester, or in Manchester. The truth is that, although the workpeople are subsisting on one-third of their usual incomes, they have sufficient to keep them in moderate health, with their non-exhausting occupations and purer atmosphere. It is to be hoped that the Privy Council will withdraw or amend Dr. Buchanan's Report, as it may interfere with the action of ladies' visiting committees, the results of which in a social and financial point of view can hardly be estimated too highly. Besides this, it always injures a cause to overstate facts; and we cannot afford to forego any portion of the benevolent aid stately remitted to us. In London, there is a Society which has attracted very little public notice, but which in an unostentatious way has done great good. It administers "The Lancashire Supplementary Relief Fund." It is charging itself with the entire care of 1000 families, so selected as to exclude no religious denomination. The first condition of reciprocity is that the family shall receive no aid from any other source. The selection rests with the local Secretary, who is nominated by the Committee. Thirty Dukinfield families are aided in this way.

I have to acknowledge gratefully the receipt of the following:

*Donations of Money.*

Dr. York, Cheltenham .....	£1	0	0
Miss S. E. Thornton, The Elms, Birmingham .....	0	10	0
A Friend, by Miss Cogan .....	0	10	6
Master Nettlefold ... ..	0	2	6
Miss Nettlefold .....	0	2	6
Henry Crabb Robinson, Esq. ....	12	10	0
Portsmouth Congregation, by the Rev. H. Hawkes .....	5	0	0

*Donations of Clothing.*

R. A. Marsden, Esq., two bags of clothing.  
 Miss Widdowson, a box of clothes.  
 From York, old and new material.  
*Times* for Reading-room, daily, Mrs. James Heywood.

ALFRED ASPLAND.

## CRITICAL NOTICES.

*Inaugural Lecture delivered in the Common Hall of Glasgow College, Tuesday, January 6, 1863. By Rev. John Caird, D.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow.*

THE appointment to the chair of Theology in the University of Glasgow of Dr. Caird is a remarkable event, and reflects no little credit on the Senatus Academicus of that University. The talents and personal accomplishments of this gentleman, and especially his repute as the most gifted, impressive and instructive preacher of his day in Scotland, quite justify the appointment. A finer model than Dr. Caird of all that a preacher should be, could scarcely be found among his countrymen. What makes his appointment remarkable is, that Glasgow is the most rootedly Calvinistic city in Europe. Surely a good time is coming when in such a city a liberal divine, who habitually preaches a moral and spiritual rather than a dogmatic Christianity, who habitually pleads for the largest toleration and the kindest Christian spirit, is appointed to be the instructor and the example of the youth of the west of Scotland in divinity.

His entrance on his new duties was inaugurated by the delivery before a learned and brilliant audience of a lecture which was listened to with general admiration. In compliment to the prevailing taste and mental habits of his countrymen, Dr. Caird selected a philosophical subject, but contrived, with the skill of a practised orator, to make ideas essentially metaphysical, sufficiently plain and perspicuous. After a survey of the various branches of human knowledge and the relations of science to theology, and a defence of physical studies as not indisposing, but rather forming an appropriate discipline for theological researches, he enters upon the inquiry, which Mr. Mansel's Bampton Lectures have familiarized to many, whether the knowledge of things supernatural is accessible to human intelligence? Regarding the position taken by the Oxford metaphysician as an effectual bar to all theological inquiry, Dr. Caird presents a popular view of the arguments by which Mr. Mansel and his school defend their views, and then he attempts their refutation.

As a theologian and a Christian philosopher, Dr. Caird resents the supposition that theological knowledge is unattainable by the human mind. Following in some things the course of confutation suggested by Mr. Goldwin Smith in his admirable little book, entitled, "Rational Religion," which contains more truth and wisdom than many ponderous folios, he shews that much of the argumentation which he sets himself to refute is a confounding of logic with reality, forms of thought with real existences. After detailing some of the conclusions to which the Oxford metaphysics would conduct the mind, Dr. Caird thus proceeds :

"If this philosophy be true, it is the apotheosis of zero, its highest type of religion would be sheer vacuity of mind, and of all human beings the idiot would be the most devout. The God of whom it proves us to be ignorant is not the God either of reason or of revelation—not our infinitely wise, holy, loving, gracious Father in the heavens, who has manifested Himself, His very nature and being, in the perfect manhood of Christ—but a mere metaphysical

abstraction, loveless, lifeless, inane, of whom you can neither affirm anything nor deny anything; who may, therefore, be just as likely foolish as wise, malignant as benign, evil as good. Who cares to be told that we labour under an inherent incapacity of knowing such a God? These teachers come to us with an air of humility; their philosophy is vaunted as the suppressor of all pride of reason. 'Vain man would be wise,' say they; 'but, henceforth, let intellectual arrogance hide its head. Let not human reason presume to erect itself into the criterion of truth, or to scan the being and ways of the Infinite!' But there is no real lesson of humility in such teaching. It is a humiliating acknowledgment that through indolence or moral obliquity we lack a knowledge which we might have possessed, but there is no humility in confessing a necessary and involuntary ignorance. It does not imply any great meekness of spirit in a man to admit that he cannot fly, or walk on the sea, or that he does not possess a seventh, or tenth, or twentieth sense—for all these are natural incapacities which difference no man from his neighbours. And so it is not humiliating to acknowledge, with our philosophers, that we do not know that which no mortal, no finite being, by any conceivable effort, could ever know."

Dr. Caird pleads that the argument of Mr. Mansel proves too much for its author.

"It proves the impossibility not only of rational religion, but of all religion—of a knowledge of God by revelation as well as by reason. The ostensible aim of these teachers is to shew that though we cannot know God we yet must believe in Him, and that as reason is incapable of discovering Him, we are entirely dependent for our religious knowledge on revelation. This is the conclusion to which they *wish* to lead us; but the conclusion to which they logically *do* lead us is that neither from reason nor revelation, nor any other source, can we ever gain any, the faintest, knowledge of God. For it will be observed that the incapacity under which the mind is said to labour, in virtue of which we do not know the Absolute, is not of the nature of a remediable defect. A supernatural revelation might convey to us a knowledge which, though possible to us, transcends our unaided powers of discovery, as a telescope renders visible objects we could not see with the naked eye. But no telescope could enable a *blind* man to see; and neither could any revelation discover God and divine things to a race destitute of any faculty by which they can be known. The unknowable is also the unrevealable. If the structure of our faculties be such that we cannot escape from the finite and the phenomenal, these faculties remaining, no power or influence in the universe—not even a light from heaven—could make us see beyond the finite and phenomenal, for to do so would be to achieve the feat of making a man see without eyes. But, you may say, God can confer on the blind the organ of vision. Though we lack the faculty by which the Absolute can be known, God may bestow upon us this vision and faculty divine. But the answer is ready, for the disability which this philosophy supposes is one which pertains to us not as human beings, but as finite beings—not as defective creatures, but simply as creatures. It is therefore a disability which applies to all finite and created beings, which could only cease by our ceasing to be finite. It is conceivable that God may hereafter confer upon us other organs of sense, other faculties of knowledge, opening up new and at present inconceivable experiences to our consciousness. But never, in all the ages, can there be conferred upon us the power to know that which the finite can never know. The creature must be transformable into the Creator before it can know the Creator. God, therefore, can never be known. Neither now nor hereafter, neither by man nor angel, nor any other created intelligence, can the faintest glimpse of His being be discerned. And the awful conclusion is reached that the Father of the universe is shut out from all communication with His children, and they from Him. Eternal isolation is the condition of His being. Ever near, He is yet ever distant. In Him all creatures live and breathe. His presence is indi-



cated in all life, and order, and beauty; in all thinking things, all objects of all thought. Yet He Himself—the secret source and origin and sustainer of all—the living God, to whom all loving hearts turn, after whom all pure spirits yearn, for whom all souls, in their deep inextinguishable longings, in their want and weakness and weariness, cry out—is for ever beyond their reach; the dweller in infinite darkness, in grim incommunicable solitariness, in eternal silence.”

Dr. Caird professes it not to be his intention to teach in the spirit of this philosophy.

“Humility is wholesome, but not the humility which teaches us to abjure our birthright, or to court the master’s approval by telling him that he hid his talent in the earth. It is well to study and learn the limits of human knowledge, but it is not well or wise to prescribe ignorance as the remedy for presumption, or as the only alternative to soaring ambition to take to grovelling in the dust. The self-sufficiency of reason it is well to check; but it is not, therefore, necessary to prevent its vagaries by a self-imposed banishment from the presence of God.”

After alluding to those attributes of God which surpass our present powers of knowledge, he proceeds:

“All this admitted, it does not follow that because we cannot know all, our partial knowledge is therefore not to be trusted—that, because human intelligence cannot comprehend God, it can have no real knowledge of Him—that because it cannot find out the Almighty unto perfection, it can never know Him at all. Hopeless and universal indeed would be our ignorance if that can never claim to be real knowledge which is not perfect knowledge. In that case we are not only incapable of knowing God, but also our fellow-men and ourselves; for who will declare that he has fathomed the depths of a single human heart, or that the philosophy of the human mind contains no insoluble problems? If, then, we feel that we do know something of our brother, though we cannot know all, we conclude that our knowledge of God may be real, though it can never be exhaustive. ‘He hath given us an understanding to know Him that is true.’ ‘This is life eternal, that they might know Thee, the true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent.’”

It is due to the Professor to state that we take these extracts from a report of his lecture in the *Glasgow Daily Herald*. We have been the more desirous of preserving them in our columns, as we do not know that the lecture has yet appeared in a separate form, revised by its author.

---

*History of the Old Presbyterian (now Unitarian) Congregation of Maidstone.* By R. E. B. Maclellan. Pp. 23.

WE had hoped that the year just closed would have produced a rich harvest of local congregational histories. Some well-executed sketches of the kind have appeared in the *Unitarian Herald* and in the *Inquirer*. But it is better that such works should appear separately, and thus have a local circulation and take an enduring form. Mr. Maclellan has put together very well the materials that survive, or at least are at present known, of the history of the congregation to which he ministers.

Maidstone and the county of Kent generally were strongly imbued with Puritan influences. When the great exodus took place in 1662, the county and the Isle of Thanet supplied a goodly number of faithful confessors. It is to be regretted, however, that the details of their lives given by Calamy are scanty. Of many of the ejected clergy the names only appear. The early history of the Maidstone Presbyterian congregation is connected with no less than five of the ejected clergy. Mr.

Maclellan has done good service in collecting the particulars of their lives and works. The chapel in Earl Street was not built till 1736. It is an interesting fact that from the formation of the congregation (in 1672) till that time, the service was conducted in the chancel of St. Faith's church, which had been granted to the Dutch church. These Protestant emigrants came over in the sixteenth century, flying from the relentless persecution of the Duke of Alva. An interesting history of them might be drawn up. In our State Papers there are many references to these exiles for conscience' sake, who were sometimes in theological speculation considerably in advance of the people amongst whom they had found an asylum.—We heartily commend Mr. Maclellan's little History to our readers' notice. We hope our friends at Maidstone still regard themselves as Presbyterians. That title is not at variance with the other title which, according to Mr. Maclellan's title-page, they *now* use of *Unitarians*. We would jealously adhere to the right of the *Presbyterian* name, of course interpreting it as a synonym of religious liberty. From the Presbyterian trunk the goodly and vigorous branches of Unitarian opinion shoot and grow.

---

*Messrs. Longmans' Notes on Books.*

FROM this periodical work, issued quarterly by the great publishing firm of the Longmans, and which contains an analysis of the principal works published by them, we extract with much pleasure the instructive account of the Revised Translation of the Holy Scriptures of the Old Covenant, by the late Rev. Charles Wellbeloved, the Rev. George Vance Smith, B.A., and the Rev. John Scott Porter, recently issued by the Unitarian Association.\* We hope shortly to give a still more critical analysis of this valuable contribution to biblical literature.

"It is a characteristic of the present times, that questions respecting the inspiration and authenticity of the Old Testament, which used to be confined to theologians by profession, are now eagerly discussed by all classes of men. Such discussions can lead to no satisfactory result, while the unlearned reader is obliged to rely implicitly on the Authorized Version, the imperfection of which has been long acknowledged by Biblical scholars, both within the Established Church and beyond its pale. A revision of this version, by public authority, has been earnestly desired; but, though the fact is admitted that it is based on a text in which modern criticism finds much that is faulty, and that its renderings are often inaccurate and even unintelligible, such a revision appears as remote as ever at the present moment. It is natural, therefore, that those who reverence the Scriptures, and regret the misconceptions to which they are exposed, by the inaccurate form under which they are presented to the English reader, should endeavour by their individual labours to supply a want so generally felt.

"The authors of this Revised Translation of the Old Testament have corrected the Hebrew text, where the labours of Kennicott and his successors have shown it to be inaccurate. In respect to the revision of the translation, while they have endeavoured everywhere to present a faithful and intelligible rendering, they have adhered as closely as possible to the style and idiom of the Authorized Version, which two centuries and a half have rendered sacred to the religious mind of England.

---

\* We are glad to announce that the Secretaries of the Unitarian Association are authorized, by a recent vote of the Committee, to continue to the members and friends of the Association the sale of the Translation during the present year at the reduced rate of eighteen shillings, where direct application is made to them at the office.

"The mode of printing the Scriptures, broken into chapters and verses, often obscures their meaning and connection. The beauty and harmony of the poetic portions of the Old Testament are also greatly impaired by their being printed as prose. In the present work, the narrative matter is distributed into paragraphs, according to the connection, and in the poetical books the arrangement in parallel versicles is preserved, which is an essential character of Hebrew poetry."

---

*The Providential Planting and Purpose of America. A Discourse preached in the Church of the Messiah, Montreal, on Sunday Evening, 21st of December, 1862. By Rev. John Cordner.*

It has been a good custom in the American churches to celebrate, both politically and religiously, the anniversary of the landing at Plymouth Rock of the Pilgrim Fathers. Mr. Cordner, though not an American citizen, but a resident in Canada and a loyal subject of Great Britain, felt himself, under the singular condition of the United States, called upon to discourse to his flock, on the eve of the great American anniversary, on the striking but not easy subject we give above. He looks at the interesting portion of the world's history which relates to the Pilgrim Fathers and their descendants in the light of religious faith. After a striking sketch of the events which made the Pilgrims exiles from their native land, he draws attention to an illustration of the proverbial maxim, "Man proposes but God disposes," in the disappointment of one of the original plans of the exiles.

"The proposed destination of the Puritan Pilgrims was Virginia. They carried no charter from the crown, for the King would not grant them a charter. But they obtained a grant of land from the company in London, and steered for Virginia. A few years previously the tobacco plant had been brought into that colony; and about the time they were starting, the first importation of negro slaves was landed there. In all probability, then, the result of their human proposal to colonize Virginia would have been to make them and their posterity planters of tobacco through the labour of negro slaves. But another destiny awaited them. The divine disposal of these men was quite different from this. Their little ship in her voyage bore too far northward even for the northern Virginia which they sought. Their eyes never saw that shore, and when land at length appeared, it was the rugged coast of Massachusetts. They were now too much wearied by long tossing on the deep to seek for any other, and here they resolved to land. But before they should land they had something to consider. They carried no royal charter. Their landing-place was not within the limits of the Virginia company. They must, however, have some bond of law—some recognized political order and constituted authority—to carry ashore along with them. A political compact was drawn up in the little cabin of the 'Mayflower' and signed by every man of the Pilgrim band. They put their hands to the instrument which bound them to order in a political society. They asserted and confessed its authority. All this they did of their own free will and accord, and then they sought a fitting landing-place. Slowly and with much toil they gained the shore, and on Plymouth Rock they planted the system of popular government—a government of the people by the people. . . .

"Thus God works in history, opening new epochs and new fields to civilization. In the early dawn and opening day of human history, Asia, the cradle of our race, had its time of greatness. For more than twenty centuries past, Europe has held the palm, and its order of civilization has been dominant in human affairs. In the discovery and planting of America, God's high purpose is visible. Here is a vast continent—a new world—with unfathomed resources and rapid and rapidly augmenting means of communication with the old world, offering an outlet to its superabundant populations—thus



placing them in new spheres of activity under a new set of conditions. Chief among these is the acknowledged right to manage their own affairs—to govern themselves without let or hindrance from mere inherited or traditional privileges, which lie as a depressing weight on the masses of the people of the older lands of Asia and Europe. The full significance and matured promise of American civilization lie in the future, and are not to be reached by any royal road or easy way, but through much stumbling and struggles and tribulation, as we may clearly see at this time.”

On the subject of slavery, Mr. Cordner speaks as becomes a preacher of righteousness and Christian freedom:

“No man nor nation can outwit God, or set at nought his law with impunity. The people of the United States are, and have been human, and prone to all human errors. The common vices which attend a rapid material prosperity have been theirs. ‘A thorn in the flesh was given them,’ as to the apostle of old,—‘a messenger of Satan to buffet them, lest they should be exalted above measure.’ But they dallied with the thorn instead of plucking it out, and it bred a festering sore in their body politic, corrupting it and inflaming it, until it has come to threaten its very life. In the importation of negro slaves into Virginia about the same time that the Pilgrims landed in Massachusetts, we see the foundation laid of another order of society, and a very different one from theirs. In the system of slavery, we see the primal rights of man ignored. The type of society thus introduced into the Virginia colony grew after its kind, and matured into an extensive oligarchy, spreading southward into the regions which invited slave labour.”

After detailing the struggle of the oligarchy in the Southern States for the permanence and the diffusion of negro slavery, Mr. Cordner proceeds thus:

“Men may push their human purposes according to their selfish interests—their wilfulness and their predominating passions—thus may they ‘cast the lot into the lap’ of history, ‘but the whole disposing thereof is of the Lord.’ All hopeful human progress must be worked out on a field of freedom, where the natural rights of every man must be not only conceded but protected, no matter what may be his height, weight or colour. All laws enacted to the prejudice of men on account of these distinctions, or any of them, are essentially unjust—out of the line of the Divine order, and at variance with the infinite justice of God.”

On the subject of the hostility which has since the commencement of the civil war developed itself with such fierceness in the Northern States against England, Mr. Cordner offers this apologetic remark:

“This hostility, in the manner and measure of its expression, and in view of the simple facts of the case, has been unreasonable and unjust, and has been prejudicial to the Federal cause in the mind of the English-speaking populations of the globe. Its existence, however, may be readily explained, and may be extenuated. A man cannot be expected to look at things reasonably, or express himself calmly, when a strong and desperate hand is at his throat and a loaded revolver at his head. And this has been the situation of the neighbouring nation of the United States for two years past, as it is at this day.”

The eloquent Canadian preacher mentions in pleasing contrast the movement lately set on foot in the North, to contribute to the relief of the suffering operatives of England.

The thought has doubtless passed through many minds, on both shores of the Atlantic, since this deadly war began, what, were he living, would the good and great Dr. Channing say? The following eloquent remarks by Mr. Cordner may in part suggest the answer:

“And here I gratefully call to mind the language of one of New England’s saintliest sons, spoken from his pulpit in the metropolis of the Pilgrim State

at a time when hostile passions ran high between the Old England and the New. During the last war which was waged between Great Britain and the United States, the calm voice of Channing was heard—the voice of a true Christian prophet of the Lord—bearing generous testimony to the foe which then openly threatened their shores. Then was the old nation spoken of as ‘an illustrious nation, which for ages has defended and nurtured the interests of religion, science and humanity,—a nation to which grateful Europe is now offering acknowledgments for the protection she has extended over the oppressed. . . . When such a nation is our foe,’ he continues, ‘we should feel it unworthy and debasing to encourage a rancorous and vindictive spirit. Let not approaching danger disturb recollections or unsettle our principle.’ I had read these words before this year or the last; but not until I had witnessed the excitement of these times of war, and the imperious sway which popular passion exercises over all organs of public utterance, did I appreciate the prophetic courage of that heroic and saintly man, as he lifted up his voice to mitigate national asperities and vindicate the character of an open foe. All honour to the heroic soul that could hold fast by love and justice amid the rising tides of tumult which would sweep both away! His last public utterance was for the freedom of the slave, being an address on the anniversary of emancipation in the British West Indies. On his way homeward after that noble utterance he was prostrated by bodily illness, and amid the glories of an autumn sunset, among the hills of Vermont, on the Lord’s-day, he closed his eyes in the sleep of death. All honour, I say again, to his saintly spirit! God sendeth such as he as lights and landmarks for the ages. He died twenty years ago, but

‘What words he spoke for freedom shall not die.’”

In comparing the policy of the North and the South, while admitting the halting gait of the former in relation to the question of slavery, he avows his preference on the whole of its policy. He thus describes the object of the Southern Confederacy:

“Its avowed purpose of basing its contemplated nationality on human slavery as the corner-stone, ought to be regarded as an outrage to the moral sense of the civilized world. It is at variance with justice and divine order, and though it should appear to succeed for a time, it must come to nought in the end. . . . The Divine Providence does not work backwards after this fashion. Free popular government was not planted in America by the Puritan Pilgrims, watered by their tears, and sanctified by their prayers and sufferings, to be superseded or permanently checked by the designs of an oligarchy eager for the buying and selling and enslavement and perpetual degradation of a weaker race of fellow-men. The stars of the firmament may fall from their courses and the hills of the earth may topple from their foundations, but the onward march of God’s providential order, by the way of justice, liberty and love, will be onward still. From ocean to ocean stretches this new continent, with its spreading miles of virgin soil in every degree of latitude, inviting settlers from the older lands to fell and plough and sow, themselves the owners sole, with no lord of domain between them and the Lord of all. God has indicated its destiny as a large habitation where the humanity of man and the dignity of labour will be recognized and have fitting respect. We of this generation stand only on the threshold of American history, yet have we entered on goodly cities which we builded not and vineyards which we planted not. In our own day we labour, and others will enter into our labours. The men of this generation may stumble in their march, but God guides the pilgrimage to a consummate civilization—to an order of society wherein the working forces and gracious influences of the gospel will have done their work in loosing the bands of wickedness and breaking every yoke, in convincing men of sin and lifting them into practical harmony with God.”

We have seen no sermon, speech or leading article, on the subject of



the American war, better entitled to consideration than the calm yet eloquent words of our Unitarian brother at Montreal.

---

*National Review.* No. XXXI.

THE Broad Church, it is often said, has considerable affinity with our denomination. The change which has just taken place in the conduct of the *National Review* will, we think, tend to dispel this delusion. Unless we are very greatly mistaken, there will speedily be a great change in the readers of this periodical. During nearly a quarter of a century, under the successive titles of *Christian Teacher*, *Prospective Review*, *National Review*, in its pages has a *free* theology found voice. It is now to be the mouthpiece of those who would fain persuade themselves and the world that their iron handcuffs are only silver bracelets.

In an article against eternal torments, apparently by a recent convert from the doctrine, the writer makes the most painfully laboured efforts to persuade himself he is free. We used to think there could be but one meaning to the words of the Creed, "without doubt he shall perish everlastingly." The writer, however, while admitting that the authors *may* have believed in endless punishments, suggests that,—perhaps "by accident," perhaps "*by the overruling providence of God*,"—the notion is *not* distinctly enunciated in *any* of the Church Canons, Articles or Formularies. Truly God's special providence was well occupied in handing to our ecclesiastical gaolers rotten ropes when in the act of binding us!

Still we cannot but think that if the authors of the Creed believed in eternal torments, they meant to express the idea by the words "perish everlastingly,"—words than which there can hardly be stronger; if so, this and no other is their legitimate meaning.

Similarly in the Catechism, the child is taught to pray that God will keep it from "everlasting death." In the Homily on the Peril of Idolatry, we are warned to refrain, if we "dread everlasting damnation." In that on the Sacrament, we are told that if we take the Sacrament without earnest repentance, we drink the cup "to our eternal destruction." In the Homily on Salvation, it is called salvation "from death everlasting." And if we turn to the Authorized Version, we read of some who "*shall* be tormented day and night for ever and ever." Surely this novel task of the Holy Ghost—to guide the pens of the *successors* of the apostles so that they shall *not* express their meaning—has been ill performed.

Two works are reviewed which were noticed in our last No., Colenso's *Pentateuch* and Merivale's *Roman History*. As we might anticipate, the Bishop's very interesting Preface is left unnoticed, while the critical portion is over-valued, as is natural with those to whom the subject is comparatively new.

The specimens we gave of Mr. Merivale's loose translations and of his unfair treatment of Tacitus, will enable our readers to appreciate the reviewer's unqualified praise of the historian's scholarship and candour.

There is a long article giving a very unpromising account of the state and prospects of learning in the Established Church. The spirit of the writer appears in his assertion that the levelling tendency of advancing civilization is adverse to freedom of opinion. He laments the "wanton havoc" of the cathedral provision for learning, "scattered by the



Bishops" themselves. Sydney Smith's witty episode to the Synod of Dort sufficiently explains how this happened, and with so dim an impression, as we must confess to, of the services previously rendered to learning, we can hardly join in the wail.

When the writer complains that the pulpit is now largely recruited by mere pass-men (he might have said literates), he entirely overlooks, among the hindrances that keep men of high character out of the Church, one of the most influential, the fact that the cure of every soul is recognized as absolute property,—that except by favour or purchase no Anglican clergyman is permitted to follow his calling, while in the present state of our population there are few patrons who have not claimants among their immediate connections.

A thoughtful Christian can hardly read the picture here drawn of the Established Church, without asking himself whether it could possibly be that to such an one had Christ specially committed the care of his flock.

An article on International Law, while advocating universal freedom of ocean transit during war even in war stores, would still retain the right of blockade. To support this notion, it says that our army being so inferior to our navy, without our right of blockade, France, Austria, Russia or Prussia, might set us at defiance, rob our travellers, imprison our citizens, &c., and we should be utterly powerless unless we were prepared to send an army to fight at a distance against overwhelming odds; and our disadvantage in America would be still greater.

This seems a shocking prospect. But if this be so, one is tempted to ask how it is that we do not *now* find ourselves at the mercy of Austria, which has next to no foreign commerce, and of Switzerland and Saxony, which have none. The extraordinary idea that if the present occasion for navies were removed, other nations might put down their fleets and render ours useless, having none to fight, is far too good to be true. England would then be the safest of all countries, more isolated than even little Switzerland. No possible chance of our ever being invaded again, while without hindrance we shall be able to land our forces wherever we please.

The extending knowledge of the mutuality of commerce must soon lead to the perception that by stopping your enemies' trade you may injure yourself still more. In the Russian war the distress in England would have been great had not Russian tallow, hemp and corn, found their way here much as usual; and after our recent experience, were we to go to war with America, the last thing we should do would be to forbid its cotton.

With the present universal completeness of internal communication, England has now become the only European country that may not henceforth laugh at blockade. Even in North America, now as we may consider it permanently divided, either North or South will receive freely over the border. While England, and England alone, already with the largest commerce in the world, must remain permanently dependent, and must ever become more and more dependent, on freedom of ocean transit.

One of the greatest and best checks to war is its yearly increasing direct expense. The abolition of blockade will tend to increase this, and far beyond the saving to private commerce; and this public expense is generally felt and therefore more influential.

## OBITUARY.

Dec. 17, at Heidelberg, aged 48, MARY, wife of Dr. John JONES, and daughter of the late Ebenezer Johnston, Esq., of Stamford Hill. And on Dec. 27, JAMES STANLEY, youngest son of Dr. JONES.

Jan. 5, SARAH, relict of the late William FISHER, Esq., of Woodside, Sheffield, aged 76.

Jan. 10, at his residence, 1, Highbury Park North, London, EDWARD FREDERICK TESCHEMACHER, aged 71.

Jan. 17, at Woolwich, Mr. CHRISTOPHER HARRIS, aged 60 years.

Jan. 18, at Canterbury, in the 58th year of her age, MARY ANN, the beloved wife of Mr. Edward COWELL. She was the daughter of the late Rev. William Thomas, formerly pastor of the Unitarian Baptist church at Headcorn, and sister to the Rev. T. F. Thomas, of Newport, in the Isle of Wight. In her the Unitarian cause at Canterbury has lost a consistent professor, a cordial supporter and zealous friend, for in all congregational affairs she took an active interest and exercised an influence of the most effectual kind. Few have passed away more sincerely and deeply regretted than this excellent woman. In the house of prayer she will be especially missed by the "two or three gathered together" there, since she was a worshiper most steadfast and devout, neglecting no religious office and suffering nothing less than sickness to withhold her from the fellowship of those who there "keep holy-day." Of her faith it may be truly affirmed that it was of the *heart*, full of lively concern

to benefit her fellow-creatures, and owning no "provocation" but unto "love and good works." She *lived* its truth, manifested its charity, exercised its power and experienced its peace. In the domestic circle she has left a vacancy which will be severely felt by her sorrowing husband; for in her character were combined and happily exhibited all the endearing qualities that mark the affectionate wife and that constitute the charm of home. Her place, indeed, now knoweth her no more; but though we mourn her departure, our sorrow is not without hope. She is gone, we feel assured, to her blissful rest. May we who survive her walk worthy of re-union with such in the mansions of a Heavenly Father's house! And may this blessed expectation and glorious hope be the consolation of our bereaved and sorrowing souls!

Jan. 20, in her 82nd year, at the Wylde, Bury, Lancashire, Miss GRUNDY, of Seedfield. The death of this venerable lady leaves a void not soon to be filled in the family, the Sunday-school, the church and the world. In her were combined in happy proportions practical good sense, high principle, religious sensibility and Christian benevolence. Her life and character were a pleasing illustration of the influence of Unitarian Christianity in giving a high aim and in inspiring the resolution necessary to attain it. Yet such was her habitual cheerfulness, and so meekly did she bear her faculties, that few of her friends supposed her so far advanced in her pilgrimage, or thought the summons from the duties of life to the rewards of a better state was at hand.

---

## MARRIAGES.

Dec. 27, at the Upper chapel, Norfolk Street, Sheffield, by Rev. Brooke Herford, ROBERT, second surviving son of the late Alexander RENTON, Esq., and grandson of William Renton, Esq., Midhill, East Bank, to EMILY DODWORTH, only surviving daughter of Mr. Henry BENNETT, William Street.

Jan. 1, at Rosslyn-Hill chapel, Hampstead, by Rev. Dr. Sadler, CHAS. CASSAL, Esq., Professor of French in University College, London, to Madlle ANNE LOUISE VICTOIRE CASSAL, of Ferrette, Haut Rhin.

Jan. 8, at Cross-Street chapel, Manches-

ter, by Rev. William Gaskell, M.A., J. G. WHIFFIN, Esq., Paymaster in the Royal Navy, to ALICE, only daughter of the late Thomas BROWN, Esq., and niece of H. J. Leppoc, Esq., of Manchester.

Jan. 22, at the Unitarian church, Hackney, by Rev. R. Brook Aspland, M.A., CHARLES GRISWOLD, Esq., of New York, late United States' Consul at Manilla, to ISABELLE ALEXANDRINA, daughter of the late Henry Theodore SIMON, Esq., of Penang, and adopted daughter of Edward Gassett, Esq., of Boston, U.S.